

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 739

HE 002 541

AUTHOR

Lindquist, Clarence B.

TITLE

NDEA Fellowships for College Teaching, 1958-1968;
Title IV, National Defense Education Act of 1958.

INSTITUTION

Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.1

PUB DATE

71

NOTE

188p.

EDRS PRICE

MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58

DESCRIPTORS

College Teachers; Doctoral Degrees; Federal Aid;
*Federal Programs; *Fellowships; Financial Support;
*Graduate Students; Graduate Study; *Higher
Education; *Teaching

IDENTIFIERS

*National Defense Education Act Title IV

ABSTRACT

Title IV of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), passed in 1958, was intended to alleviate an existing and projected shortage of qualified college teachers. This was to be accomplished by means of awarding 3-year fellowships for full-time study to doctoral candidates interested in college teaching, by institutional allowances for strengthening graduate programs, and by a wider geographical distribution of strong graduate programs. This report provides a detailed legislative and administrative history of the Title IV program, including the origin of Title IV, the conceptualization of NDEA, the hearings and passage of the Act, implementation of Title IV and its history during 11 years of its operation, the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit controversy, and a statistical review and evaluation of the Title IV program. (AF)

ED054739

NDEA fellowships for college teaching 1958-68

TITLE IV

National
Defense
Education
Act of
1958

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIG-
INATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 002 541

NDEA **TITLE IV**
fellowships
for college National
teaching Defense
1958-68 Education
ACT OF
1958

by

CLARENCE B. LINDQUIST

Regional Coordinator
Graduate Academic Programs Branch
Bureau of Higher Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Elliot L. Richardson, *Secretary*

Office of Education/S. P. Marland, Jr., *Commissioner of Education*

93542003

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. HE 5.255:55058
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington: 1971

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 — Price \$2
STOCK NUMBER 1780-0792

foreword

To a great many Americans in the fall of 1957 the Russian success in orbiting the first manmade satellite posed a challenge to the American educational system. A principal response to that challenge was the approval one year later, under bipartisan auspices, of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA).

A twin objective of the NDEA was to widen the scope and to increase the quality of American education from elementary school through graduate education. Title IV, in particular, was intended to alleviate an existing and projected shortage of qualified college teachers. This was to be achieved by means of awarding 3-year fellowships for full-time study to doctoral candidates interested in college teaching, by institutional allowances for strengthening graduate programs, and by a wider geographical distribution of strong graduate programs.

Speaking in Chicago in April of 1959 at the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Elliot L. Richardson, then Assistant Secretary of HEW, described title IV of NDEA as "a significant milestone in Federal assistance to graduate education." He said that it marked "a major step away from the purchase-of-services approach to graduate education and toward an acknowledgment of the vital dependence of our Nation's future on the development of its best brains in every field of advanced study."

During the first 10 years of the title IV program, over a third of a billion dollars has been expended in support of

26,828 graduate fellowships. Over half this amount has gone to students in the form of stipends and family allowances; the remainder has been paid to the institutions at which the fellows have been enrolled. The number of new fellowships awarded annually began with 1,000 in the fall of 1959, and continued with 1,500 for the next 5 years. There followed a period of rapid expansion, when the number increased to 3,000 in 1965, and again to 6,000 in 1966 and 1967. Since 1967 the number has again declined to about 3,000 a year.

It is the intent of this report to provide a detailed legislative and administrative history of the title IV program. Any operation spending as much money, supporting as many students, strengthening as many graduate programs, and producing as many college teachers as it has, surely deserves such a full-scale treatment. The reader who does not have the time to read the complete report will find a brief history of the program at the beginning of Chapter XV.

It is to be hoped that the taxpayers of the Nation, their representatives in the Congress, and the countless teachers and administrators connected with title IV programs will gain from this history a better appreciation of the substantial advantages which the program has brought to American higher education.

PETER P. MUIRHEAD
*Executive Deputy Commissioner
of Education*

contents

	Page		Page
Foreword	i.1	Chapter III.	
Chapter I.		IMPLEMENTATION OF TITLE IV AND FIRST	
THE ORIGIN OF TITLE IV	1	YEAR OF OPERATION	21
Swelling College Enrollments	1	First Supplemental Appropriation Passes	22
Earned Doctorates	2	Early Steps Taken to Implement Title IV	22
Concern With the Number of Years Taken		Policies Established Pertaining to Institutions and	
to Earn the Doctorate	2	Administration of Program	23
The Harvard University Study	2	Advisory Committees	23
The Columbia University Study	3	"Borrowed Graduate Dean" Concept	23
Newly Employed Full-Time College Teachers		Institutions to Select Fellows	23
Not Possessing the Doctorate	3	Forward Financing	23
Conferences on the Status of Graduate Education	3	Preference to Small and Medium-Size Institutions	23
The President's Committee	4	All Fields of Graduate Study to be Eligible for	
The U.S. Office of Education Conference	4	Fellowships	23
The Developing Federal Interest in Higher Education		Criteria for New and Expanded Programs	24
Prior to 1958	5	Attributable Costs	24
Morrill Act of 1862	5	Policies and Regulations Pertaining to Students	24
The Period Following World War II	5	Fellowships to be Limited to those Pursuing a Ph. D.	
The Impact of Sputnik	6	or Similar Degree	24
Chapter II.		Fellowship Awards to be Limited to First-Year Graduate	
CONCEPTUALIZATION OF NDEA, HEARINGS,		Students	24
AND PASSAGE OF THE ACT	8	Limited Teaching by Fellows to be Permitted	24
Legislative Recommendations of HEW Task Force	9	Additional Regulations	25
Legislative Preparation in the Congress	9	Regional Briefing Meetings Held	25
House Subcommittee Hearings	10	Guidelines Given for Applications	25
Hearings Resume in January 1958	10	Approval Announced of 48 Programs, 160 Fellowships	26
Senate Committee Hearings	11	Question Raised About a Program Approval in the	
The President's Message on Education	11	Field of Religion	26
Graduate Education Provisions of the Administration's Bill	12	Hearings on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1960	26
Bureau of the Budget Endorsement of S. 3163	12	Hearings on Fiscal Year 1959 Second Supplemental	
Graduate Education Provisions of the "Committee Bill"	13	Appropriations	27
Secretary Folsom is First Witness	13	Remaining Fiscal Year 1959 Fellowships Awarded	27
Commissioner Derthick Testifies	13	Attributable-Cost Forms Sent to Institutions	27
Testimony of Non-Government Witnesses	14	Chapter IV.	
Shortage of Teachers and Need for a Federal Program	14	SECOND YEAR OF OPERATION	29
Fellowship Distribution Among Institutions	15	Information and Forms	29
Fellowships for All Fields of Study	15	Payment Information to Fellows	29
Amount of Fellowship Stipend	15	Policy and Procedure Manual	29
Desirability of Requiring Some Teaching by Fellows	16	Institutions Sent Application Forms and Instructions	30
Institutional Support and Attributable Costs	16	Dean Bent Requests Institutions to Waive Tuition and Fees	30
Revised House Bill Emerges as Result of Committee		Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of October 3, 1959	30
Hearings	16	Ineligibility of Advanced Students Discussed	30
Comparison of Fellowship Provisions of New and		Committee Asks for More Consultants	31
Old House Bills	16	Fellowship Distribution Proposal Raises Controversy	31
Revised Senate Bill Emerges as Result of Committee		Committee Approves Three Motions	31
Hearings	17	Dean Bent's Report to Association of Graduate Schools	31
Comparison of Fellowship Provisions of New and		Recommendations for Changes in Regulations	32
Old Senate Bills	17	Other Comments	32
Floor Action in the House	17	Evaluation of 1960-61 Program Applications	32
Floor Action in the Senate	18	Policy Recommendations	33
Conference on H.R. 13247	18	Inception of the <i>Fellow's Handbook</i>	33
Final Floor Action	19	Hearings on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1961	34
National Defense Education Act of 1958 Becomes Law	20	Commissioner's Response to Criticism of Certain Approved	
		Title IV Programs	34
		Meeting of the Advisory Committee on May 13 and 14, 1960	
		New or Expanded Programs Versus Existing Programs	35

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
Tuition for Title IV Fellows	35	Hearings on H.R. 3000	61
Recommendations	35	Administration Spokesmen Testify	62
The Chase Study	36	Views of the American Council on Education	62
Dean Bent's Letter of Late May 1960 to Title IV		Hearings on S. 580	63
Coordinators	36	Views of the Association of State Universities and	
Other 1959-60 Activities	36	Land-Grant Colleges and the State Universities	
1960-61 Fellowship Awards Announced	37	Association	64
		Commissioner Keppel Testifies	64
		Mrs. Green Introduces H.R. 6061	65
		No Bills on NDEA Amendments Reported Out Despite	
		Hearings	65
		Appropriations for 1963-64	66
		Gustave Arlt Discusses NDEA Title IV at Midwest	
		Conference	66
		Other 1962-63 Activities	66
Chapter V.			
THIRD YEAR OF OPERATION	38	Chapter VIII.	
Regulations on Administration of Title IV Published in		SIXTH YEAR OF OPERATION	67
<i>Federal Register</i>	39	The October 1963 Competition for 1964-65 Fellowships	67
New Manual Issued for Participating Graduate Schools	39	Guidelines for Panel Members	67
Question on Distribution of Fellowships	39	Competition Results	68
Assistant Commissioner Babbidge Reports on Title IV to		Change of Award Procedure	68
Association of Graduate Schools	39	One-Year Extension of NDEA Approved in December 1963	69
Administrative Problems Faced by the Graduate		Deadline for Title IV Applications Advanced to June 1	70
Fellowship Section	40	1963 Title IV Amendments Announced	70
Title IV Competition for Academic Year 1961-62	40	Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of March 16, 1964	71
Secretary's Panel of Consultants Makes Recommendations	40	House Special Subcommittee on Education Resumes	
Administration Recommends Amendments to NDEA	41	Hearings	71
Bills to Amend NDEA Introduced	42	Senator Morse Resumes Hearings on College Student	
1961 Congressional Hearings on Amendments to NDEA	42	Aid Legislation	73
Administration Spokesmen Testify	42	Supplemental Appropriation Requested for Vacated	
Witnesses from the Higher Education Community	43	Fellowships	73
U.S. Chamber of Commerce Opposes Expansion of		First Rewards of Vacated Fellowships	73
Title IV	44		
Opposition to Title IV Fellowships Related to			
Theological Subjects	44		
Clean Bill Reported by House	44		
Clean Bill Reported by Senate	45		
Minority Views	46		
Two-Year Extension of NDEA Passed	46		
Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1962	48		
End-of-Year Activities	50		
Chapter VI.			
FOURTH YEAR OF OPERATION	51	Chapter IX.	
Commissioner Implements Congressional Recommendations		SEVENTH YEAR OF OPERATION	75
on Eligible Fields of Study	51	H.R. 11904 Reported Out of Committee	75
The October 1961 Association of Graduate Schools		Minority Views on H.R. 11904	76
Meeting	52	Senate Committee Reports Out a Clean Bill, S. 3060	77
The Competition for 1962-63 Fellowships	53	S. 3060 Passed by Senate	77
Advisory Committee Meeting of October 31, 1961	54	House Considers H.R. 11904	78
Hearings on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1963	54	Conference Report	79
Advisory Committee Meeting of April 28, 1962	55	Conference Report Accepted by House and Senate	80
End-of-Year Activities	56	President Johnson Signs S. 3060 Into Law	81
Chapter VII.		The Language of Title IV as a Result of Amendments	
FIFTH YEAR OF OPERATION	58	of 1963 and 1964	81
Committee Set Up to Recommend Procedures in Regard		Supplemental Appropriation Bill Signed Into Law	82
to Criminal Records	59	Regular Appropriation for Fiscal Year 1966	82
Committee Recommendations Implemented	59	Planning for Implementation of the 1964 Amendments	82
Competition of October 1962 for 1963-64 Fellowships	59	"Centers of Excellence" Concept	82
Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on		Commissioner's Informal Meeting of November 7, 1964	83
December 12, 1962	60	Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of	
President Kennedy's 1963 Message on Education	60	November 14, 1964	83
National Education Improvement Act of 1963—Bills		Institutions Notified of New Policies	84
Introduced	61	New Guidelines for Allocation of Fellowships	84
		Allocation of Fellowships for Tenure Starting with	
		Fall Term, 1965	84
		Allocation of Fellowships for Tenure Starting with	
		Fall Term, 1966	85

	Page
Policies Pertaining to the Award of Regular and Vacated Fellowships	86
Agreement Not to Discriminate	87
Second Competition for 1965 Fellowships	88
Restriction Removed Against Award of Fellowships for Study in Classics, Fine Arts, Drama, and Music	89
Regional Briefing Sessions on 1964 Title IV Amendments	90
Policy on Supplementary Stipends Announced	90
Dr. Ferguson Addresses Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research	90
Institutional Reaction to New NDEA Policies	91
Panelists Review Fellowship Applications for 1966-67	91
Organizational Changes	92

Chapter X.

EIGHTH YEAR OF OPERATION	93
Advisory Committee Meeting of July 7-9, 1965	93
Congress Notified of Fellowship Allocations for 1966-67	94
Applicants Informed of Competition Results	94
Memorandum on Vacated Fellowships Sent to Coordinators	95
Advisory Committee Meeting of March 15, 1966	95
Application and Progress Report Forms Sent to Institutions	96
Panelists Convene to Review New Applications and Progress Reports	96

Chapter XI.

NINTH YEAR OF OPERATION	97
Quality of Graduate Education Discussed	97
Advisory Committee Meeting of July 20-22, 1966	98
Notification of New Method of Payment to Title IV Fellows Announced	98
Payment to Individual Fellows	99
Timing and Mode of Payments	99
Acquisition of Entitlement by Fellows	99
Dependency Payments	99
Conference on Personnel Needs of Junior and Four-Year Colleges	99
Southern Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities Passes Resolution on Title IV Fellowship Distribution	100
Senator Lausche Objects to a Title IV Award	100
Allocation of Fellowships for 1967-68 Announced	100
Advisory Committee Meeting of November 15-16, 1966	101
Council of Graduate Schools Urges Congress to Restore Budget Cut and Extend NDEA	101
January 1967 Memorandum on NDEA Title IV Policies and Procedures	102
Higher Education Amendments of 1967 Introduced	102
Hearings on Higher Education Amendments of 1967	102
Information and Forms for 1968-69 Fellowships sent to Coordinators	102
Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation Seeks Cooperative Relationship with Title IV Program	103
Appropriation for Fiscal Year 1968	103
\$10 Million Cut in Title IV Appropriation Recommended by House Committee	104
Representative Broyhill Introduces Amendment Excluding Disruptive Students	104

	Page
Senate Committee Agrees to House Cut of \$10 Million for Title IV Program	104
Conference Report Accepted	104
Consultant Panelists Convene for Annual Review	105

Chapter XII.

TENTH YEAR OF OPERATION	106
Advisory Committee Meeting of July 10-12, 1967	106
Four Substantive Issues Discussed	106
Four Substantive Issues Discussed	106
Scholarship	106
Fragmentation or Proliferation in Academic Programs	107
Proposed Cooperation with the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation	107
Action Regarding Institutions Failing to Submit Progress Reports or Submitting Unsatisfactory Ones	107
Review of Programs and Recommendation of Fellowship Allocations	108
Request Denied for Admissibility of Certain Programs on Study of Religion	108
Bureau Recommendations on Allocations of Fellowships for 1968-69	108
House Subcommittee Report Lauds Title IV Program	108
Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of November 29, 1967	109
Discussion about Fellows Affected by Selective Service Law	109
Decision on Proposal from Woodrow Wilson Foundation Reaffirmed	110
Congress and Institutions Notified of Fellowship Allocations for 1968-69	110
Possibility Raised of Reawarding Fractional Years of Vacated Fellowships	110
New Policies and Regulations Outlined for Coordinators	110
"Higher Education Amendments of 1968"—Bills Introduced	111
Hearings on H.R. 15067	111
Hearings on S. 3098	113
Senator Spong Offers Amendment to Award Fellowships on a State-Population Basis	113
Hans Rosenhaupt Urges That a Portion of NDEA Fellowships Be Awarded Through a National Competition	113
Appropriation for Fiscal Year 1969	114
Memorandum of March 8, 1968, to Title IV Coordinators	114
Reason for Clarification of Policy on Interruption of Tenure for Military Service	115
Approval of Reaward of Partial Years of Vacated Fellowships Announced	115
New Policy on Fellowship Stipend Supplementation Announced	116

Chapter XIII.

FIRST HALF OF ELEVENTH YEAR OF OPERATION	117
Substitute H.R. 15067 Reported Out of Committee	117
S. 3769 Reported Out by Senate Committee	118
Senate Passes S. 3769	119
H.R. 15067 Passed by House	120
Senate Conferees Appointed	121

	<i>Page</i>
Conference Report on S. 3769	121
House Passes Conference Report on S. 3769	122
Senate Passes Conference Report on S. 3769	123
President Signs S. 3769 into Law	123
Max Goodrich Appointed Chief of Graduate Fellowship Program	124
Progress Reports Reviewed During Summer	124
Certain Title IV Policies Clarified	125
Reinstatement of Fellowships to Persons Other than Military	125
Consultant Panelists Conduct Annual Review on October 14-16, 1968	125
Followup Memorandum Issued Concerning Resignations for Entry into Military Service	126
Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of November 18 and 19, 1968	126
Policy Matters	126
Allocation of Fellowships for 1969-70	126
Council of Graduate Schools Holds Session on 10th Anniversary of Title IV	127
Notification of Awards Sent to Members of Congress and to Institutions	127
 Chapter XIV.	
LOYALTY OATH AND DISCLAIMER	
AFFIDAVIT CONTROVERSY	128
1959 Attempt to Repeal Section 1001 (f) of NDEA	129
Senate Subcommittee Hearings on S. 819	129
S. 819 Reported to the Senate	129
Senate Begins Debate on S. 819	129
Summary of Arguments in Favor of Repeal of Section 1001(f)	130
Summary of Arguments Against Repeal of Section 1001(f) Without Suitable Safeguards	130
Amendments to S. 819 Offered	131
S. 819 Recommitted to Committee	131
1960 Attempt to Repeal Disclaimer Affidavit	132
S. 2929 Favorably Reported From Committee	132
Minority Views	133
Individual View of Senator Prouty	133
S. 2929 Debated in the Senate	133
Senator Prouty Offers His Amendment	133
Senate Passes S. 2929 with Prouty Amendment	134
S. 2929 Dies in the House	135
1961 Attempt to Remove Disclaimer Affidavit	135
Portion of 1961 NDEA Amendment Hearings Dealing with the Removal of the Disclaimer Affidavit	135
Subcommittee Chairmen Oppose Disclaimer Affidavit	135
Commissioner McMurrin Urges Repeal of Disclaimer Affidavit	135
Other Witnesses Testify	137

	<i>Page</i>
Section 1001(f) Provisions of H.R. 7904	138
Section 1001(f) Provisions of S. 2345	138
No Floor Action Taken on Either H.R. 7904 or S. 2345	139
Disclaimer Affidavit Requirement Removed in 1962	139
Question Raised Concerning a National Science Foundation Fellowship Award	140
Proposals Made to Amend National Science Foundation Act of 1950	140
Proposal Made that NSF Amendments Apply to NDEA ..	141
Amendment to NDEA Signed into Law	142
Some Discontent with Public Law 87-835 Arises	142

Chapter XV.

STATISTICAL REVIEW AND EVALUATION OF THE SUCCESS OF THE NDEA TITLE IV PROGRAM

Title IV Program Highlights	143
Appropriations, Obligations, and Expenditures	144
Participation by Institutions	145
Program Applications and Approvals	146
Number of Applications and Approvals	146
Percentage Distribution of Approved Programs by Academic Area	147
Number of New and Rewarded Fellowships	148
Geographical Distribution of Fellowships	149
Regional Distribution	149
Distribution by State and Institution	150
Distribution of Fellowships by Academic and Subacademic Areas	151
Distribution of Fellowships by Academic Area	151
Distribution of Fellowships by Subacademic area	152
Comparison of Distribution of Fellowships by Academic Field with Certain Other Indices	152
Comparison by Broad Academic Area	152
Comparison by Subacademic Area	153
Personal Characteristics of Title IV Fellows	153
Fellowships by Sex or Student	153
Other Characteristics of the First 5,500 Title IV Fellows	154
Median Age	154
Marital Status	154
Social Background	155
Attrition of Title IV Fellows	155
The Reasons Why Fellows Resign	155
Success of the Title IV Program	156
Attainment of the Doctorate by Title IV Fellows	157
Speedup in the Attainment of the Doctorate	157
Percentage of Title IV Fellows in College and University Employment	158
Conclusion	158

appendixes

	Page		Page
Appendix A.		percentage distribution of 138,149 teaching faculty in universities and 4-year colleges and the percentage of these faculty possessing the doctorate, and (2) the percentage distribution of the combined total of doctorates awarded in 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68: By academic and subacademic areas, aggregate United States	171
Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded: Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60-1968-69	161		
Appendix B.		Appendix D.	
Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded: Annually, by year of initial tenure and by academic and subacademic areas, 1959-60-1968-69	168	Administrative heads of graduate fellowship program and membership of Title IV Advisory Committee: Year by year	173
Appendix C.			
Comparison of percentage distribution of 26,828 new NDEA title IV fellowships with (1) the spring			

text tables

1. Appropriations, obligations, and expenditures for the NDEA title IV program: Annually, appropriations and obligations from fiscal year 1959 through fiscal year 1968; and expenditures from fellowships year 1959-60 through fellowship year 1968-69	145	7. Percent distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowship awards: Annually, by year of initial tenure and academic area, 1959-60-1968-69	151
2. Number of institutions applying for program approval, number receiving approval of one or more programs, and number of active institutions Annually, 1959-60-1968-69	145	8. Comparison of percentage distribution of 26,828 new NDEA title IV fellowships with (1) the spring 1963 percentage distribution of 138,149 teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges and the percentage of these faculty possessing the doctorate, and (2) the percentage distribution of the combined total of doctorates awarded in 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68: By academic areas, aggregate United States	152
3. Number of NDEA title IV program applications and number and percent of program approvals: Annually, by nonscience versus science areas, 1959-60-1968-69	146	9. Percentage distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowship by sex of student: Annually, 1959-60-1968-69	154
4. Percent distribution of NDEA title IV program approvals: Annually, by academic area, 1959-60-1968-69	147	10. Number and percent of original NDEA title IV fellows in each class who failed to complete the full tenure of their fellowships: Annually, by year of entering class, 1959-60-1968-69	155
5. Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships authorized, requested, and awarded; number of reawards of resigned fellowships; and the total number of fellows on tenure: Annually, by fellowship year, 1959-60-1968-69	148	11. Percentage distribution of the reasons for resignation of 579 fellows from the classes of 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65	156
6. Comparison of geographical distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowship awards with earned doctorate production: By Office of Business Economics (U.S. Department of Commerce) regions, periods 1959-61, 1963-65, and 1965-68	150	12. Mean number of years from first entry into graduate study to attainment of the doctorate: Title IV fellows from the classes of 1960-61 and 1961-62 and a 1960-61 non-title IV comparison group	158

CHAPTER I

the origin of title IV

IN THE MID-1950'S the balance between the number of college and university students and the number of qualified faculty was relatively normal—but signs of an impending imbalance were becoming obvious to educators throughout the country. They observed enrollment trends ever pointing upward while recruitment of qualified faculty consistently fell short of the need. A great imbalance, the educators recalled, had existed during the 4 or 5 years following World War II. That period saw a heavy influx of students whose education had been interrupted by war service. Colleges and universities were forced to meet the faculty shortage by hiring, usually on a temporary basis, persons who lacked the standard qualifications and who therefore would not normally have been employed to teach in higher education. The problem of instructing uncommonly large numbers of students also made necessary such makeshift measures as extra-large, early-morning, late-afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes.

The threat of a disparity between student and faculty numbers in the decade following the mid-1950's appeared

all the more real when one considered the unchanging rate of doctorate production, the geographical and institutional concentration of earned doctorates, the number of years necessary for the average graduate student to earn the doctorate, and the declining percentage of newly employed full-time college faculty who possessed that degree.

Fortunately, the concern of the educators became the concern of Congress. The desire they shared to alleviate the shortage of qualified college faculty eventually took definite shape in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, of which title IV, "National Defense Fellowships," was designed as a means of increasing the future supply of college and university teachers throughout the United States.

Swelling College Enrollments

The postwar bulge in higher education enrollment reached its highest point of 2,445,000 in 1949. Two years later in 1951, enrollment declined to 2,102,000, but then began a steady increase, which exceeded three million only

6 years later in 1957. Based upon census data of children already born and upon the belief (later fully substantiated) that an increasingly larger percentage of college-age youth would be seeking higher education, a conservative estimate by the U.S. Office of Education during the late 1950's projected six million as the total enrollment in 1970. That figure was almost reached 4 years earlier in 1966, when the total exceeded 5.9 million. Observing this upward trend, the Office of Education in 1965 revised its projections for 1970 to a total of seven and a quarter million.¹

Earned Doctorates

The prospect that college and university enrollments would continue to rise was only one factor causing concern for the future of American higher education. Also disturbing was the fact that the production of earned doctorates remained nearly constant from 1952-53 to 1957-58, as shown by the following figures: ²

1952-53	8,309	1955-56	8,903
1953-54	8,996	1956-57	8,756
1954-55	8,840	1957-58	8,942

As the tabulation reveals, the number varied from year to year by fewer than 700. In 1954-55 and again in 1956-57 the number was lower than in the preceding year.

Doctorate production tended to be concentrated in a relatively small number of prestigious institutions located in a few States on the east and west coasts and in the Great Lakes region. For example, in 1957-58 over 50 percent of earned doctorates were conferred in six States as follows: New York—1,397; California—882; Illinois—747; Massachusetts—674; Pennsylvania—514; Michigan—439.³

The distribution of doctorates in the various fields of study had undergone a significant change over the years up to 1958. Of all earned doctorates, the percent in the humanities and social sciences and in biological and physical sciences from 1911 to 1920, as compared with the percent from 1951 to 1958, illustrates the change:

Field	Percent of earned doctorates	
	1911-20	1951-58
Humanities and social sciences	47	30
Biological and physical sciences	44	36

¹ Kenneth A. Simon and Marie G. Fullam. *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1974-75* (OE-10030-65, Circular No. 790). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965, p. 7.

² U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. *Earned Degrees Conferred by Higher Educational Institutions, 1957-58*. (Circular No. 527). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, p. 1.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

The percentage decline in these two groups, traditional suppliers of college teachers, contrasts with the rise over the same period in the professional fields (engineering, education, law, etc.) from 9 to 34 percent of all earned doctorates. Education alone accounted for 6 percent and 17 percent, respectively of all doctorates awarded.⁴

Concern with the Number of Years Taken to Earn the Doctorate

The inordinate number of years it took an average graduate student to earn the Ph. D. was also a growing concern. It was reflected in several studies of graduate education.

As was to be expected, these studies revealed that the "stretch-out" in the time was not due to any single cause. Inability to find a suitable thesis or a thesis adviser, foreign language hurdles, personal or family problems, change of major, change of institution, and death or moving away of the thesis adviser were certainly delaying factors for some students. But ranking very high in all these studies was the financial problem faced by many students, especially in the nonscience areas, causing them either to drop out of school for a brief duration or take on duties such as teaching or assisting in research projects, or to assume other employment, with resultant reduction in their own study loads.

The Harvard University Study

One study was conducted by J. P. Elder, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Harvard University, in the spring of 1956, with the support of the Fund for the Advancement of Education.⁵ He sent a questionnaire to 1,482 men who had taken their doctorates at Harvard between 1950 and 1954, and 135 women who had taken their doctorates at Radcliffe College during the same period, to discover their reactions to certain aspects of the graduate education they had received.

One question dealt with factors which lengthened the time it took to earn the Ph. D. The following results were obtained, combining together the responses of those who judged that the time for them was prolonged considerably and those who said the time was lengthened only slightly. Seven percent of those in the natural sciences, 16 percent in the social sciences, and 19 percent in the humanities reported that they were financially obliged to interrupt their doctoral studies and leave Harvard. Thirty-three percent of those in the natural sciences, 25 percent in the social sciences, and 38 percent in the humanities declared that their employment as a teacher or fellow at Harvard had extended the time to earn the Ph. D. Eleven percent of those in the natural sciences, 17 percent in the social sciences, and 14 percent in the humanities claimed that

⁴ Bernard Berelson. *Graduate Education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960, p. 37.

⁵ J. P. Elder. *A Criticism of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in Harvard University and Radcliffe College From Those Who Took the Ph.D. at These Institutions Between 1950 and 1954*. Cambridge, Mass.: Spring 1958. p. 48.

the necessity for engaging in outside employment while studying at Harvard had lengthened the time for them in their quest for the Ph. D.

The Columbia University Study

In a study published in 1958 Hans Rosenhaupt calculated the average time spent by graduate students entering 13 departments at Columbia University during the period 1940-56 and earning the Ph. D. by 1956. He found that the average time ranged from a low of 5.3 years in chemistry to 10.1 years in sociology and English. He believed that if the time taken for the Ph. D. could be curtailed, graduate schools could produce 10 or 20 or even 50 percent more Ph. D.'s every year without increasing library and laboratory facilities and without markedly enlarging the teaching staff. "It stands to reason," he said, "that generally students who must support themselves have less time to spend on their graduate training and that an increase in fellowship aid will at least shorten the time needed for degrees."⁶ This was further substantiated by data on these students comparing the average time taken by federally assisted military veterans with nonveterans. The veterans completed the Ph. D. more rapidly.⁷

Newly Employed Full-Time College Teachers Not Possessing the Doctorate

In the mid-1950's, Ray C. Maul, Assistant Director of the Research Division of the National Education Association (NEA), conducted a series of studies of college teacher supply and demand. The results of these studies received considerable attention in higher education circles and were widely referred to as evidence that a serious deterioration was taking place in the level of educational qualifications of college teachers.

The first NEA study in 1953-54 (covering 637 representative degree-granting institutions of all types) revealed that only 40.5 percent of the full-time staff possessed a doctorate; 20.9 percent, a master's degree plus at least 1 year of advanced study; 28.2 percent, a master's degree; and 10.4 percent, less than a master's degree.⁸ Studies during succeeding years focused on the level of preparation of newly employed full-time teachers, and showed the following results:

	1953-54	1954-55	1955-56	1956-57
Percent of newly employed full-time college teachers with				
Doctor's degree	31.4	28.4	26.7	23.5
Less than a master's degree . . .	18.2	19.3	20.1	23.1

⁶ Hans Rosenhaupt. *Graduate Students, Experience at Columbia University, 1940-1957*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958, p. 61.

⁷ Ibid., p. 62.

⁸ *Teacher Supply and Demand in Degree-Granting Institutions, 1954-55*. (XXXIII: 4) Washington: National Educational Association, 1955. p. 138.

The decreasing percentage of new college teachers with a doctorate and the increasing percentage of those with less than a master's degree led Dr. Maul to conclude that "recently employed full-time teachers are steadily reducing the general level of preparation of the entire corps."⁹

Although Dr. Maul's assessment of the situation was accepted as accurate and realistic by most educators, there were a few who disagreed. With financial assistance from the Carnegie Corporation, Bernard Berelson commenced in 1957 a major study of graduate education in the United States. At meetings on higher education he asserted that claims that there was a college teacher shortage and that it was going to get worse were grossly exaggerated. In his book published in 1960 reporting the findings of his study, he stated:

"The crisis over having enough college and university teachers in 1970 is generally overstated: the prospects do not constitute a 'dire threat' to the present level of higher education. Good salaries is one key to the situation."¹⁰

Another person who disagreed with Dr. Maul's assessment was Vladimir Stoikov of Johns Hopkins University. Using the 1952 and 1956 editions of *American Universities and Colleges*,¹¹ which contain information concerning the size of the total staff and the number of staff members holding doctoral degrees in those years, he took a stratified sample and used as weights the size of the teaching staff in each category of educational institution as given by the NEA study. He calculated that the percentage of faculty holding the doctor's degree for the institutions as a group had increased from 42.2 percent in 1953 to 49.6 percent in 1956. He contended that Dr. Maul and others who had interpreted the NEA data as Dr. Maul had were drawing erroneous conclusions because they did not take into account (1) the number of full-time staff who obtained doctorates while teaching full time and (2) the level of qualifications of staff members who, for a variety of reasons, left the colleges and universities for other employment.¹²

Conferences on the Status of Graduate Education

A series of conferences on the status of graduate education took place in the 1950's. In the fall of 1954 a group of university administrators and teachers convened at the invitation of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, with the looming shortage of competent college and university teachers foremost on the agenda.

The group, known as the Committee of Fifteen, observed that it would be impossible to maintain the existing faculty-student ratio of one faculty member for every 13 students. It estimated that between 1955 and 1970 some 484,000 new

⁹ *Teacher Supply and Demand in Colleges and Universities, 1955-56 and 1956-57*. Washington: National Education Association, 1957. p. 20.

¹⁰ Berelson, op. cit., p. 224.

¹¹ Mary Irwin, editor. *American Colleges and Universities* (6th and 7th eds.). Washington: American Council on Education, 1952, 1956.

¹² Vladimir Stoikov. "Has the Quality of the College Teacher Declined?" *Journal of Higher Education* (30:8). November 1959. pp. 455-58.

teachers would be required to provide replacements and handle the additional enrollments expected. As against this national need, the Committee estimated that during the same period approximately 135,000 doctorates would be awarded. Of the doctoral recipients the Committee expected that fewer than half would become college and university teachers. The widening gap between faculty members possessing the doctorate and those who did not led the Committee to conclude: "To expect that by 1970 the proportion of college teachers holding the Ph. D. degree will have declined from the present 40 percent to 20 percent is not statistical hysteria but grassroots arithmetic."¹³ The prospects of such a large majority of college teachers without advanced graduate degrees was "deeply disturbing" to the Committee.

The 1954 meeting of the Committee of Fifteen was followed by other meetings on graduate education in which the supply and demand situation of college teachers was discussed. At the 1956 Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, Clarence Faust, President of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, stated: "In short, we tend to regard the production of good teachers as an incidental or even low aim of graduate study. . . . We must reverse the tendency to think of production of college teachers as an unworthy purpose of graduate education. It must become a major concern."¹⁴

A national conference sponsored by the American Council on Education met in Washington, D.C., in the spring of 1958 to discuss the gravity of the college teacher shortage.¹⁵ One topic of discussion was: "Is the present Ph. D. the best degree for college teachers?" Some educators advocated a 2-year master's degree to meet the college teacher demand.

That same year, at the Southern University Conference, educators voiced alarm over the decreasing number of new faculty members with doctoral training. In introducing the discussion on graduate instruction and research, Dean Herman Spivey of the University of Kentucky asserted that "the proportion of new faculty members with doctoral training in our colleges and universities has fallen sharply, and within a few years will probably drop so low that only a fourth of our faculty members may have doctoral degrees against 40 percent now."¹⁶

The President's Committee

Similar apprehensions over shortages of college and university teachers were expressed by the President's Committee

¹³ F. W. Strothmann on behalf of the Committee of Fifteen. *The Graduate School, Today and Tomorrow*. New York: Fund for the Advancement of Education, December 1955. p. 7.

¹⁴ Clarence Faust. "Graduate Schools and the Scholar Teacher." In *Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting*. Edited by D. R. Clippinger. Ann Arbor: Cushing-Mulloy, 1956. pp. 44-45.

¹⁵ Joseph Axelrod, editor. *Graduate Study for Future College Teachers*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1958. p. 111.

¹⁶ David A. Lockmiller, editor. *Southern University Conference Proceedings, 1958*. Chattanooga, Tenn.: The Conference, University of Chattanooga, 1958. p. 17.

tee on Education Beyond the High School, which was organized in 1957 at President Dwight D. Eisenhower's request. It felt that "the most critical bottleneck to the expansion and improvement of education in the United States is the mounting shortage of excellent teachers."¹⁷ The Committee urged a nationwide effort to recruit undergraduates and graduates of high talent for college teaching, to double faculty salaries within 5 to 10 years, and to provide increased fringe benefits to make college teaching more attractive.

In March 1957 the Twelfth National Conference on Higher Education convened in Chicago. The teacher shortage problem was debated. Philip Coombs, Secretary of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, said that available projections suggested there would be one new Ph. D. committed to college teaching for every five or six new college teachers needed. At this rate, he said, the percentage of college and university teachers with the doctorate would drop from 40 percent to 20 percent. He urged that "we . . . invent a way to prepare first-class college teachers which will be very much better than the present M.A., yet less time-consuming and more to the point than the present Ph.D."¹⁸

In California the teacher shortage crisis took on special dimensions. A study by the Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education estimated that over 40,000 new full-time-equivalent staff would be needed in California between 1957 and 1970.¹⁹

The U.S. Office of Education Conference

Concern over the effect of a college teacher shortage on schools in higher education was, of course, felt in the U.S. Office of Education. The Division of Higher Education called a meeting of educators in Washington, D.C., in May 1957, to consider a prospectus of a study by the Office on the specifics of the impending college teacher shortage. Representatives of three large fields of learning discussed faculty shortages in their own areas. One conferee, Harold W. Stoke, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences at New York University, noted that the teacher shortage was "a very uneven phenomenon." In his view, the problem of faculty staffing would differ in fields of learning and be less severely felt in cities than in rural areas. Large institutions would be able to handle the teacher

¹⁷ The President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. *Second Report to the President*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1957. p. 5.

¹⁸ Philip H. Coombs. "How Will Institutions of Higher Education Select and Maintain an Adequate Supply of Qualified Teachers?" In *Association for Higher Education Current Issues in Higher Education, 1957*. Edited by G. Kerry Smith. Washington: National Education Association, 1957. p. 172.

¹⁹ *A Study of Faculty Demand and Supply in California Higher Education, 1957-1970*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1958. p. 71.

shortage problem better than the smaller colleges and universities.²⁰

Although the foregoing recital about doctoral training and the supply and demand of college and university teachers in the mid-1950's does not include everything that was written and discussed about this subject, it is sufficient to indicate what the tenor of thinking was in higher education circles at that time.²¹ It is natural that this deep concern was being felt in the Congress of the United States as well.

The Developing Federal Interest in Higher Education Prior to 1958

Historically and under the Constitution, public education in the United States has developed as a responsibility mainly of the States and local governments. However, in its infancy the Federal Government undertook two types of educational activities: (1) operating educational programs of its own, and (2) aiding the States and Territories in financing and otherwise promoting education. Both of these types of activity antedate the Constitution, and almost since the time of their inception have included all levels of education.²²

Although the Constitution made no specific mention of education or its support, certain provisions of it have furnished the basis for a great variety of Federal education activities. Foremost among these constitutional provisions is the "general welfare" clause. Exercising its constitutional power to tax and appropriate for the general welfare, the Federal Government has played an increasingly important role in the financing of education as it has become more and more important to the security and progress of the Nation as a whole.

The Federal Government's own educational pursuits can be traced back to instruction of men in the military service, which included schooling in mathematics as early as in 1777. Action by the Federal Government in support of education in the Territories and later in the States began in 1785. In that year an ordinance adopted by the Congress of the Confederation for the disposal of public lands in the Western Territory reserved one section of every township for the endowment of schools within that township. Most of the States that were admitted to the Union after

1789 were first organized as Territories. In organizing each of these Territories the Congress established a school system which was taken over by the new State upon its admission. Thus, the Federal Government became the founder of the public school systems of a large number of the States.

Morrill Act of 1862

Except for military training of officers, Federal support of higher education did not commence until the passage of the Morrill Act of 1862. Under this act a grant of Federal lands or land scrip was made available to each State in the amount of 30,000 acres for each Senator and Representative in Congress from that State. The proceeds of the sales of these grants were to be used for the endowment and support of colleges having as their primary objective "to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts in such manner as the legislatures of the States may respectively prescribe." The Morrill Act of 1862 was amended by the Hatch Act of 1887 setting up the system of agricultural experiment stations; by the Second Morrill Act (1890) providing the further support of land-grant institutions by direct appropriations; and by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, establishing a system of cooperative extension services to bring to adults the benefits of current developments in the field of agriculture.

Further Federal support of higher education developed over the years. In 1879 the Congress began making annual appropriations to Howard University in Washington, D.C., a privately controlled institution devoted primarily to the education of Negroes. The Federal Government began assistance to college housing, on a temporary basis, under an extension of the Lanham Act of 1941. The Housing Act of 1950 and College Housing Amendments of 1955 provided for a continuing program of loans to colleges and universities for the construction of dormitories and other buildings. An act of the 84th Congress initiated a 3-year \$90 million program of grants for the construction of research facilities for medical, dental, public health, and other nonprofit institutions.

During World War II the Federal Government accumulated a large quantity of real and personal property which later became surplus. In passing the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Congress initiated a policy of making available some of this property for educational use through donation and through purchase, with discounts allowed for public benefit. Subsequent legislation augmented and extended the provisions for donations of Federal surplus property for educational and health purposes to tax-supported or tax-exempt health and educational institutions. In addition, the Federal policy of granting to nonprofit institutions of higher education exemption from corporate income taxation has given them important, if indirect, financial assistance.

The Period Following World War II

Following World War II a number of new Federal programs provided financial support to college students.

²⁰ Clarence B. Lindquist, editor. *Staffing the Nation's Colleges and Universities*. Report of a Conference, May 20 and 21, 1957. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1957. p 45.

²¹ For a complete bibliography on college teacher supply and demand as well as all other aspects of graduate education, the reader should refer to: James H. Blessing. *Graduate Education, An Annotated Bibliography* (OE-50022, Bulletin 1961, No. 26). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 151 pp.

²² Most of the material for this brief account of the development of Federal interest in education is taken from *Federal Educational Policies, Programs and Proposals, Part I*, prepared by Charles A. Quattlebaum in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the House Committee on Education and Labor, and published by the U.S. Government Printing Office, March 1960. For a detailed account of the evolution of Federal policies in education, see this document.

More than seven million veterans of World War II were financially helped through college under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, popularly known as the GI Bill, approved by Congress in 1944. Two million Korean Conflict veterans received financial assistance under an amended version of this act.

The National Science Foundation, established by Congress in 1950, inaugurated a fellowship program in the 1952-53 academic year. In addition, through grants for the support of basic scientific research, the Foundation indirectly supported a number of graduate and post-doctoral students performing research services for the grantees. The Foundation also supported summer institutes for science and mathematics teachers. The Atomic Energy Commission, established in 1946, and the Public Health Service, starting with the National Cancer Institute Act of 1937, contributed support to higher education through research grants, fellowships, and traineeships. With the passage of Public Law 83-531 in July 1954, authorizing cooperative research in education, the Office of Education commenced modest support of educational research in colleges and universities through its Cooperative Research Program.

The foregoing account of Federal assistance is not a complete, all-inclusive inventory of every Federal program that contributed, directly or indirectly, to higher education. It does, however, include the major ones and serves to show that by the time the National Defense Education Act was being considered in Congress, the Federal Government had, over the years, evidenced an increasing awareness of the value of higher education to the welfare and security of the country. Thus, when the debates took place in Congress over the bill which resulted in the passage in September 1958 of Public Law 85-864, cited as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, ample precedent has been established for Federal assistance to education.

In the several years immediately preceding 1958, as a consequence of the specter of rising enrollments and a shortage of qualified teachers and facilities, many bills had been introduced in Congress and considered by congressional committees. Especially persistent were bills to give financial aid to students through loans, scholarships, and fellowships. None of these bills was passed, however.

The Impact of Sputnik

It took a dramatic event on October 4, 1957, to galvanize the Nation into demanding that Federal action be taken in regard to education. On that date the Soviet Union put into orbit its "Sputnik," the world's first manmade satellite. Agonizing reappraisals of our educational system followed and charges were made that the Russians were surpassing us as a result of superior education. Upon his return to the United States in June, 1958, after a month's study visit of education in the U.S.S.R. along with nine other prominent U.S. educators, U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick reported that the Soviet Union had put a very high priority on education as a means of na-

tional advancement. Speaking to the National Press Club in Washington on June 13, 1958, he said:

"What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular: we were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U.S.S.R. is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we went we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to total commitment to education."²³

Our national leaders, including many prominent educators, regarded Sputnik as a challenge to improve American education. One of these, Franklin D. Murphy, Chancellor of the University of Kansas, in speaking to the American Council on Education in Washington, D.C., October 11, 1957, interpreted this historic event as follows:

"The message which this little ball carries to Americans, if they would but stop and listen, is that in the last half of the twentieth century—in this age of incredible technological change—nothing is as important as the trained and educated mind. This sphere tells us not of the desirability but of the *urgent necessity* of the highest quality and expanded dimensions of the educational effort. It states more dramatically than ever before that the future of the twentieth century lies in the hands of those who have placed education and its Siamese twin—research—in the position of priority."²⁴

The ferment engendered by the Russian feat made a great impact upon the 85th Congress. Some 1,500 bills were introduced which were wholly or partly related to education. The National Defense Education Act of 1958, which eventuated out of this welter of educational bills and debates in Congress, was a landmark in Federal legislation because of its breadth and scope of Federal support of education. Because of the feeling, evidenced in hearings and debates in Congress, that the Soviet manmade satellite and Soviet education were presenting a challenge to American superiority, it is not surprising that the word "Defense" appeared in the title of the act.

Although general Federal support of education was advocated by some, Congress felt that greater good would be accomplished at that time by giving categorical aid to areas of education which it felt were in greatest need of support. Thus, the National Defense Education Act, later to be commonly known as NDEA, had 10 titles. Although the other titles were likewise of far-reaching significance, the remainder of this report will be concerned only with title IV, National Defense Fellowships, for the graduate training of college-level teachers.

It should be remarked, however, that title IV is not the only title of NDEA under which graduate fellowships have been awarded. Title VI, Language Development, authorized advanced training to individuals in modern foreign languages and related area studies. Since the law authorized

²³ Lawrence G. Derthick. "The Russian Race for Knowledge," *School Life* (40:9), June 1958, p. 3.

²⁴ Franklin D. Murphy. "The Real Meaning of the Satellite," *The Educational Record* (39:1), January 1958, p. 35.

the Commissioner of Education to support the study of any language where adequate instruction was not readily available and where specialists were needed in the national interest, the Commissioner decided that emphasis would be given in title VI to non-Western languages. Because of the demands in these critical areas, no fellowships have been awarded under title VI in French, German, Italian,

and Pennisular (Iberian) Spanish—languages which have been supported with title IV fellowships. Over 12,000 fellowships, ranging in length of tenure from 8 weeks to 12 months, were awarded in the first 10 years of title VI compared to 26,828 new fellowships (26,251 3-year awards, 540 2-years awards, and 37 1-year awards) in all fields of study under title IV over the same period.

CHAPTER II

conceptualization of NDEA, hearings, and passage of the act

The conceptualization of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 had its origin in a memorandum of June 20, 1957, from John A. Perkins, Under Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick. The memorandum pointed out that the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School was soon to issue its second interim report and that it would be very important at that time for the Department to review the problems of higher education and, in particular, the work of the Committee. Mr. Perkins said that, for this purpose, he was constituting a task force from within the Department. The memorandum specified the type of representation the task force would have and outlined its duties:

1. Undertake an intensive review of the second interim report of the President's Committee on Education Beyond

the High School and develop a Departmental position thereon.

2. Review problem areas not covered or not adequately treated by the Committee.

3. Develop legislation for action programs recommended by the President's Committee and accepted by the Department.

4. Develop action plans for Departmental activities recommended by the President's Committee and accepted by the Department which would not require legislative action.

5. Develop a promotion and leadership program to foster the implementation of recommendations made by the President's Committee and endorsed by the Department which would be directed at State and local governments, universities, business, etc.

Legislative Recommendations of HEW Task Force

On July 17, 1957, Commissioner Derthick sent a memorandum to each of the members of the task force¹ announcing that the first meeting would be held on July 24 and that the task force would meet biweekly for the initial 2 months and monthly thereafter. The memorandum stated that staff services to the task force would be provided by the Division of Higher Education.

At the opening meeting a plan of operation for succeeding meetings was agreed upon. A staff paper was to be prepared on a specific aspect of higher education which would serve as the basis for discussion for each meeting. The Division of Higher Education was given the responsibility for preparing the papers.² The staff members who prepared a paper usually presented it to the task force and served as resource persons during its discussion.

After several meetings, six areas of higher education were identified as deserving of legislative consideration:

1. Assistance to graduate education
2. Grants for State planning
3. Aid to less-than-degree-length programs
4. Financial support to undergraduate students
5. Expansion of grants for land-grant colleges
6. Aid for physical facilities

Task force members were asked to assign priorities to the six areas. Aid to graduate education was given the highest priority.

On October 31, 1957, the Division of Higher Education presented in some detail its recommendations for legislative action relative to the six areas. In regard to graduate education, the Division proposed:

1. Aid to graduate school, for expansions of programs and for provisions to accommodate increased numbers of graduate students.

Federal Government to pay up to \$125,000 to each institution, one-half the cost of expansion of programs.

Funds, including matching funds, to be used for salaries of teachers, supplies, and equipment.

2. Fellowships for graduate students to encourage increasing numbers of qualified persons to pursue graduate study.

Fellowships to be awarded for full-time graduate students; \$2,000 for each fellowship plus \$400 for each dependent, up to a maximum of three dependents.

Fellowships to be awarded on an annual basis, but to be

¹ In addition to Commissioner Derthick who served as Chairman, the members of the original task force were George St. J. Perrott, representing the Public Health Service; Willis D. Gradison, Jr., (who was almost immediately succeeded by Homer D. Babbidge, Jr.) assistant to Secretary Folsom for program analysis; Wesley L. Hjernevik, assistant to Under Secretary Perkins; Joseph H. Meyers, representing the office of General Counsel; Ralph C. M. Flynt, representing the Office of Education; and Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, *ex officio*, who directly represented HEW Secretary Marion B. Folsom in legislative matters.

² The staff paper on the shortage of college and university teachers was prepared by J. Harold Goldthorpe, Jennings B. Sanders, and John B. Whitelaw.

renewable each year, upon satisfactory progress by the student, until he has accomplished his objective; but no more than two renewals would be made, making a total of 3 years.

Fellows to be selected by the institutions.

3. Administration.

Program to be administered by the Commissioner of Education under supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Commissioner to be authorized to establish a National Advisory Commission on Graduate Education to advise him with respect to basic policies in the administration of the act.

Each institution to submit a plan to the Commissioner for approval.

Funds to be allotted to institutions in accordance with regulations made by the Commissioner, with approval of the Secretary, on the basis of plans submitted by the institutions.

The Division proposed that 50 graduate schools be assisted during the first year, 100 the second year, and 150 the third year. Five hundred fellowships would be awarded the first year; 1,000 the second year; and 1,500 the third year. The suggested appropriation for the first year was \$7,650,000, increasing to \$25 million by the third year. The following statement was given in justification of the Division's recommendations on graduate education:

Owing to the increasing cost of graduate education to students and to the economic opportunities available today, students in sufficient numbers will not pursue graduate studies unless the financial assistance is sufficient to enable them to do it without too great a personal sacrifice. Moreover, graduate education is very costly to the institutions and many cannot afford the outlay and operation costs involved in expanding their programs and facilities to the extent that is now required. It seems clear, therefore, that the needs of graduate students and graduate schools will not be adequately met without substantial Federal assistance.³

The legislative proposals developed by the task force were forwarded to Secretary Folsom so that he could present them at the November 8, 1958, Cabinet meeting which was devoted to a discussion of the administration's legislative program.

Legislative Preparation in the Congress

While the Office of Education task force was proceeding with its work, the Congress was moving ahead on its own with the consideration of possible legislation to deal with the many problems besetting American education. In particular, under the chairmanship of Representative Carl Elliott, Democrat of Alabama, the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee made preparations to commence hearings on scholarships

³ Suggested Legislative Proposals Meeting of October 31, 1957. Commissioner of Education files. pp. 1-3.

and other assistance for students in higher education. These hearings commenced on August 12, 1957. Later, with the advent of Sputnik, the concern in both the House and Senate widened to include the consideration of strengthening education in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

The ultimate success that was achieved by the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was the result of close cooperation between a Republican administration and a Democratic Congress. The importance and extent of this close relationship is revealed in an account given by William Stanley Hoole, who, under contract to the Office of Education, wrote an early history of NDEA:

"Realizing the compelling necessity for a nonpolitical, nonpartisan approach to the serious educational problems facing the United States in mid-1957, and sincerely desirous of having his Subcommittee on Special Education report a bill which would eventually prove acceptable to Congress, Representative Elliott early sought the advice and cooperation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, particularly the Office of Education.

"After a careful comparison of the principal provisions contained in certain education bills already before Congress, he invited Under Secretary Perkins and Assistant Secretary Richardson and their associates to meet with his Subcommittee and together to survey matters concerning scholarship and other financial assistance for students in higher institutions. After a lengthy conference, during which the representatives from the Department formulated a number of suggestions regarding the scope and character of the proposed hearings, Mr. Richardson expressed appreciation for the opportunity Representative Elliott had extended them and offered further assistance. Admittedly, it was this spirit of cooperation between Representative Elliott and the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—later enlarged and refined by the added cooperation of Senator Hill—that eventually made possible the adoption of a non-partisan legislative program agreeable to all interests concerned. As Assistant Secretary Richardson later declared:

"One of the most important elements of these early negotiations was the conscious effort we made to provide information about what we were thinking. . . . If it had not been for the fact that the Democrats had their own Bill essentially consistent in its approach to the Federal role, it is quite doubtful whether legislation would have resulted. But as it was, we had a situation in which we and Hill and Elliott were proposing legislation of essentially the same character. I heard Hill talk on the subject once or twice and he always stressed this fact, as we did ourselves in our own contact with the [Capitol] Hill; and, of course, the result was that it became possible to negotiate with the sponsors of the Democratic Bill on a basis that simply required the accommodation of the two Bills in coverage and amount and so on . . .

"I think in any case that Senator Hill and Congressman Elliott deserve a great deal of credit for seeing the opportunity presented by working on a program consistent

with what they understood the Administration was doing, rather than going off in a wholly different direction.'"⁴

House Subcommittee Hearings

As already mentioned, hearings on the National Defense Education Act of 1958 actually got under way in the summer of 1957. The Special Subcommittee on Education held hearings in Washington, D.C., on August 12, 15, 16, 22 and 27; in Eau Claire, Wis., on October 28; Sioux Falls, S. Dak., on October 30; Salt Lake City, Utah, on November 1; and Portland, Oreg., on November 4, 1957.⁵

In his opening statement on August 12, subcommittee chairman Carl Elliott declared:

"Today marks the first of a series of hearings to be held by the Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor on the subject of a Federal scholarship and loan program for capable high school students who cannot otherwise attend college.

"In the course of these hearings, we wish to study the problems and issues and to collect the basic facts concerning the needs and resources for student financial aid. We will afford many individuals, agencies, and organizations that hold an interest in these problems an opportunity to voice their opinion or raise their questions. . . . These studies are not at this point related to any specific bill or bills now pending before this subcommittee, though I may say there are many such bills, and as I understand from talking to some Members of Congress, others will be introduced later. However, our study to date or at this point, will be based upon the subject matter itself."⁶

In line with the stated objectives as outlined by Congressman Elliott, the hearings in 1957 concentrated almost exclusively on the need for financial aid for undergraduates in the form of scholarships and loans.

Hearings Resume in January 1958

When the Subcommittee resumed its hearings on January 8, 1958, in Washington, D.C., the impact on the Congress of Russia's Sputnik of October 4, 1957, was apparent. In his opening remarks, Chairman Elliott said:

"It would be unnecessary indeed, for me to remind you that only 90 days ago the American people were suddenly awakened to some of the shortcomings of our educational system. Today no one believes that the American system

⁴ While carrying out this assignment, Mr. Hoole was on leave from his position as Librarian of the University of Alabama. For an excellent and well-documented account of the early problems, personalities, and issues connected with NDEA, the reader should refer to his unpublished manuscript, *The National Defense Education Act of 1958. A Brief Chronology*. This manuscript, dated December 1960, is in the archives of the U. S. Commissioner of Education.

⁵ Other members of the Special Subcommittee on Education were: Democrats Edith S. Green of Oregon and George S. McGovern of South Dakota, and Republicans Stuyvesant Wainwright of New York and Donald W. Nicholson of Massachusetts.

⁶ *Scholarship and Loan Program*. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House, 85th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958. p. 1.

is superior simply because it is American. Our proud complacency has vanished. In the press, over the airwaves, on street corners and in homes, among businesses, and professional men, including educators themselves, we now hear a constant clamor for the refinement of curriculum and for the improvement of teaching at all levels, from the grammar to the graduate school. The American people are excited about our schools and our colleges, our students, our teachers, our research programs, and our principles of instruction as they have seldom before been excited about anything of similar nature. They say that American education must be without parallel in the world and to that end we must do whatever needs to be done."⁷

January 8 was the only day during that month of 1958 in which the subcommittee held hearings. There is no doubt that meetings were held in abeyance pending the President's message on education and the introduction of the administration's and opposition party's bills which would become the subject of the hearings. The subcommittee met for 10 days in February, 15 days in March, and 3 days in April. Covering the period from the date the hearings commenced on August 12 of 1957 until their termination on April 3, 1958, a total of 2,096 pages of testimony, inserts, and appendixes were printed by the U.S. Government Printing Office in three parts, for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Senate Committee Hearings

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, commenced its hearings on Science and Education for National Defense on January 21, 1958, under the chairmanship of Senator Lister Hill, Democrat of Alabama.⁸ Whereas a subcommittee of the parent Committee conducted the hearings in the House, the Whole Committee conducted the hearings in the Senate. The hearings were held for 5 days in January, 10 days in February, and 7 days in March, and produced 1,602 pages of print (testimony, inserts, and appendixes).

In both the Senate and House hearings a large number of individuals testified. These persons included leading scientists, educators, representatives of professional and educational organizations, and members of both the Senate and the House. As evidence of the great congressional interest in these hearings was the fact that eight Senators and 15 Members of the House of Representatives appeared in person to testify. The many days in rapid sequence devoted to the hearings also indicated the sense of urgency that was being felt at that time.

As it had been in the House hearings, the success of

Sputnik was clearly of major concern in the Senate as the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held its first hearings. In his opening statement, Senator Hill said:

"A severe blow—some would say a disastrous blow—has been struck at America's self-confidence and at her prestige in the world. Rarely have Americans questioned one another so intensely about our military position, our scientific stature, or our educational system.

"The Soviet Union, which only 40 years ago was a nation of peasants, today is challenging our America, the world's greatest industrial power, in the very field where we have claimed supremacy: the application of science to technology.

"We Americans are united in our determination to meet this challenge. We Americans know that we must give vastly greater support, emphasis, and dedication to basic scientific research, to quality in education, to instruction in the physical sciences, to training in foreign languages and to developing to the full our intellectual, cultural, and scientific resources. We Americans know we must mobilize our Nation's brainpower in the struggle for survival."⁹

The concern with Sputnik was also evidenced by the fact that all seven witnesses who testified at the January hearings of the Senate Committee were distinguished American scientists.

The President's Message on Education

On January 27, 1958, President Dwight D. Eisenhower transmitted to Congress his message on education outlining his recommendations for Federal steps to improve American education.¹⁰ For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President set the following five objectives:

1. Reduce the waste of talent (through testing, guidance and counseling services, scholarships).
2. Strengthen the teaching of science and mathematics.
3. Increase the supply of college teachers.
4. Improve foreign-language teaching.
5. Strengthen the Office of Education.

Under the mandate to "increase the supply of college teachers," the following specific recommendation was made:

"To help assure a more adequate supply of trained college teachers so crucial in the development of tomorrow's leaders, the administration recommends that the Congress authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide—

"(a) Graduate fellowships to encourage more students to prepare for college teaching careers. Fellows would be nominated by higher educational institutions.

⁷ Ibid., p. 663.

⁸ Other Committee members were Democratic Senators James E. Murray of Montana, John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Patrick V. McNamara of Michigan, Wayne L. Morse of Oregon, Strom Thurmond of South Carolina, and Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas; and Republican Senators H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey, Irving M. Ives of New York, William A. Purtell of Connecticut, Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona, Gordon L. Allott of Colorado, and John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky.

⁹ *Science and Education for National Defense*. Hearings Before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Senate, 85th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958. p. 2

¹⁰ Special Message to the Congress on Education. January 27, 1958. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Dwight D. Eisenhower 1958*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. pp. 127-32.

"(b) Federal grants, on a matching basis, to institutions of higher education to assist in expanding their graduate school capacity. Funds would be used in the discretion of the institution itself, either for salaries or teaching materials."

In his message the President also made a number of recommendations to strengthen the programs of the National Science Foundation, including an expansion in the Foundation's graduate fellowship program. The President regarded his recommendations on improvement of education as essential to our national security—in fact, as an emergency program. He concluded his message with this strong statement:

"This emergency program stems from the national need, and its fruits will bear directly on national security. The method of accomplishment is sound; the keystone is State, local, and private effort; the Federal role is to assist, not to control or supplant those efforts.

"The administration urges prompt enactment of these recommendations in the essential interest of national security."

Following the transmittal of the President's message, the administration bill was introduced on January 27 in the House by two identical bills—H.R. 10278 by Carroll D. Kearns, Republican of Pennsylvania, and H.R. 10279 by Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., Republican of New Jersey—and in the Senate by a third identical bill, S. 3163 sponsored by Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican of New Jersey, for himself and 10 other Senators. The principal rival bills, S. 3187 and H.R. 10381, were introduced in the Senate on January 30 (legislative day, January 27) by Senator Lister Hill for himself and 26 other Senators and in the House on January 30 by Representative Carl Elliott. The House bills were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate bills to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.¹¹

Graduate Education Provisions of the Administration's Bill

The administration bill was to be cited, if enacted, as the Educational Development Act of 1958. Its purpose was to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes; strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools; provisions of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate

programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign-language teaching; improvement of State education records and statistics; and for other purposes.

The bill had five titles, the fourth of which was "Expansion of Graduate Education." It authorized such appropriations as Congress deemed necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and each of the succeeding 5 years, for grants to assist institutions in establishing new or expanding existing programs of graduate education leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or equivalent.

The bill provided that a grant to an institution, with a ceiling of \$125,000, could not exceed one-half the cost of the salaries of additional faculty members needed for new programs or the expansion of existing programs and the cost of increases in salaries of existing faculty members to reflect additional duties occasioned by such new programs or the expansion of existing programs. The bill also provided for other costs attributable to the establishment of new programs or expansion of existing programs, including overhead costs and costs of equipment.

If an institution preferred, the bill would provide an institutional payment equal to \$500 multiplied by the number of fellowships in such programs plus the cost of payments to graduate students enrolled in new graduate programs or whose enrollment constituted an increase in enrollment in existing graduate programs. Such fellowships, including allowances for dependents, were to be in such amounts as were permitted by the regulations of the Commissioner of Education and were to be awarded annually under criteria approved by the Commissioner. Preference was to be given to individuals who were interested in teaching in institutions of higher education and were to be renewable to the extent necessary to enable the recipient to secure the degree awarded at the completion of the course of study of the graduate program involved. No fellowship, however, could be held for more than 3 academic years.

The administration bill also provided for the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Education to advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Commissioner on matters of policy or general administration of this title. The Committee was to consist of 12 members, who would be selected so as to provide a broad representation from among various graduate fields, institutions of higher education with programs of graduate education, and the general public.

Bureau of the Budget Endorsement of S. 3163

On February 14, 1958, Robert E. Merriam, Assistant Director, Bureau of the Budget wrote Senator Hill in response to the Senator's request for the Bureau's views on S. 3163 and stated: "The bill incorporates the recommendations of the President on additional Federal programs to strengthen general and science education, as set forth in his recent message to the Congress on the educational system. I am authorized to advise you, therefore, that enactment of S.

¹¹ Between January 7 and April 16, 1958, 10 other bills on education were introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. Between January 9 and February 25, seven other bills on education (two by Senator Edward J. Thye, Republican of Minnesota, and three by Senator Ralph E. Flanders, Republican of Vermont) were introduced in the Senate and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

3163 would be in accord with the program of the President."¹²

Graduate Education Provisions of the "Committee Bill"

The bill, S. 3187, introduced by Senator Hill and to be cited, if enacted, as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, had 14 titles, of which the seventh was "National Defense Fellowships." H.R. 10381, introduced by Representative Elliott, was identical to S. 3187 except that title XIII, "Science Information Service," of S. 3187 was deleted; title XIV, "Miscellaneous Provisions," of S. 3187 was made title XIII of H.R. 10381. Because the two bills were identical except for this minor difference, they became known as the "Committee bill" and sometimes as the Hill-Elliott bill in honor of its two principal sponsors.

The purpose of the Committee bill was to strengthen the national defense, advance the cause of peace, and assure the intellectual preeminence of the United States, especially in science and technology, through programs designed to stimulate and to increase the number of students in science, engineering, mathematics, foreign languages, and other disciplines, and to provide additional facilities for the teaching thereof; to promote the development of technical skills essential to the national defense; to assist teachers to increase their knowledge and improve their effectiveness, and for other purposes.

The "National Defense Fellowships" title of the Committee bill authorized appropriation of funds necessary to award 1,000 fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and 1,500 fellowships during each of the succeeding 5 fiscal years. Such fellowships were to be for periods of study not in excess of 3 academic years. The fellowships were to be awarded by the Commissioner to persons of demonstrated ability and special aptitude for advanced study.

A fellow was to receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second such year, and \$2,400 for the third such year, plus \$400 for each such year on account of each dependent. In addition, the bills provided a cost-of-education payment to an institution, not in excess of \$1,000 per academic year, for each fellow enrolled.

A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title had to maintain satisfactory proficiency in, and devote essentially full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded. The study had to be pursued in an institution of higher education, and the fellow could not engage in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities approved by the Commissioner of Education, during any period for which the fellowship was held. The Commissioner would have the right to terminate or suspend a fellowship if a fellow failed to comply with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner.

The Committee bill also provided for a National Ad-

visory Council on Science and Education to advise and assist the Commissioner in the determination of the fields in which fellowships would be awarded and in the preparation of general regulations for the administration of this title.

In its analysis of the Committee bill, the Office of Education estimated that the fellowship program of the Committee bill would cost \$4.8 million for fiscal year 1958, increasing to \$12.2 million for fiscal year 1960, while the comparable title of the administration bill would cost \$7.8 million, increasing to \$16.0 million for these same years.

Secretary Folsom is First Witness

After the introduction of the bills that would receive principal attention, both the Senate Committee and the House subcommittee stepped up the pace of the hearings. As expected, administration spokesmen were among the first to be called to testify. The first witness speaking on behalf of the administration bill in both the House and Senate hearings was Marion B. Folsom, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In his opening remarks to the House subcommittee on February 3, 1958, Secretary Folsom stated the historic Federal interest in education:

"This national interest in education has been demonstrated throughout our history. As early as 1787, the Continental Congress, in setting aside certain lands for educational purposes, expressed the national interest in education with this historic declaration:

"... knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the maintenance of education shall be forever encouraged." ¹³

As to the national need for a Federal program to strengthen American education, Secretary Folsom declared:

"This program thus stems from a matured recognition of clear truth which the American people can never afford to forget: The ability of this country to survive in a world where freedom is imperiled may depend largely upon the strength of American education." ¹⁴

Secretary Folsom made a strong plea for support of graduate education. He pointed out that the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School had identified the need for more qualified college teachers as the most critical single need facing higher education. He cited data showing that the current production of doctorates was falling far short of the need. Because college teachers were needed in all fields, he urged that no restrictions be placed on areas of study. He also recommended that all established graduate schools be eligible for aid.

Commissioner Derthick Testifies

Another major spokesman testifying on behalf of the administration bill was U.S. Commissioner of Education

¹² Senate hearings, op. cit., p. 161.

¹³ House hearings, op. cit., p. 694.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 695.

Lawrence G. Derthick.¹⁵ Dr. Derthick cited the high cost of graduate education and explained the reasons for it. He pointed out that graduate education requires extensive and costly library and laboratory facilities; that the direction of graduate students is largely on an individual basis, meaning that the ratio of teachers to students is necessarily high; and that, moreover, many graduate students have families for whom living accommodations must be made available. He said that the heavy cost limited the number of universities that could offer acceptable opportunities for graduate study.

Dr. Derthick stated that there were at that time 163 institutions (69 public and 94 private) out of a national total of 1,856 that conferred doctoral degrees based on graduate instruction. Of these, only 27 awarded 100 or more doctoral degrees in 1955-56. He said that the administration bill would expand existing programs of graduate education and initiate new programs. He requested and received permission to insert into the record of the hearings in both the House and Senate a detailed supplemental statement relating to the status of graduate education in the United States. Included in this statement was the following summary of existing Federal programs which offered financial support to graduate students:

"In 1954, the latest year for which we have figures, the Federal Government supported somewhat in excess of one out of every five graduate students. This means that nearly 43,000 graduate students received Federal support, at a cost of over \$50 million: The sources of this support were:

"Veterans' Educational benefits—27,000 graduate students, more than three-fifths of the total number receiving Federal support, received payments totaling \$24,725,000. There was no sharp restriction of field in this program.

"Research Assistantships—More than 5,900 graduate students were employed as research assistants on Federal contracts and grants, receiving a total of \$10,812,000. The unevenness of this support by field is indicated by the fact that 97-plus percent were in the natural sciences and less than 2 percent in the social sciences and nonscience fields. The largest part of this support was provided by research contracts of the military departments. Other agencies providing substantial support were the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Agriculture, and the National Science Foundation.

"Fellowships—1,560 graduate students in all fields of study received \$4,766,000 in fellowship aid. The National Science Foundation financed 498 graduate fellows and 24 postdoctoral fellows at a cost of \$1,320,000.

"The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

¹⁵ Other Administration witnesses from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who testified on higher education aspects of the pending bills were: John A. Perkins, Under Secretary; Elliot L. Richardson, Assistant Secretary for Legislation; Lloyd E. Blauch, Assistant Commissioner, Division of Higher Education, Office of Education; and Ralph C. Flynt, Director, Higher Education Programs Branch, Division of Higher Education, Office of Education.

financed 46 graduate fellows and 444 postdoctoral fellows at a cost of \$2,132,000.

"The Atomic Energy Commission financed 90 predoctoral fellows and 8 postdoctoral fellows at a cost of \$335,000.

"The Fulbright program financed nearly 1,100 graduate and postdoctoral fellows at a total cost of 4,299,000 in Fulbright payments.

"Traineeships—The traineeship programs of the Veterans Administration and the National Institutes of Health financed the study of 1,600 graduate students in psychology and related para-medical fields, at a cost of \$3,672,000."

The conclusion reached in the supplemental statement as a consequence of the foregoing financial-aid information is especially noteworthy:

"Important in connection with Title IV of the Administration bill presently before Congress is the fact that the most substantial support for graduate education to date has come from a source that is drying up, namely, veterans' educational benefits.

"A critical problem posed by the current pattern of support is that with the decline in support of graduate students through veterans' educational benefits, the support by the Federal Government tends to be for vocational, scientific, and technological endeavor, and not for the general types of support provided by veterans' educational programs. Many lay and professional people view with alarm programs that direct study and students into certain fields to the exclusion or neglect of others."¹⁶

Testimony of Non-Government Witnesses

Distinguished educators and spokesmen for leading professional organizations testified before the Senate and House Committees with respect to the graduate fellowship provisions of the bills under consideration.

Shortage of Teachers and Need for a Federal Program

There was unanimity among the witnesses that a Federal program of support of graduate education was desperately needed. One of the early witnesses, Frederick L. Hovde, President of Purdue University, said, "Since the supply of qualified teachers is the number 1 requirement, I believe the Federal Government should find ways and means of providing grants to graduate schools offering the doctor of philosophy degree, to aid students desiring to enter the teaching profession as a career."¹⁷

Dayton D. McKean, Dean, Graduate School, University of Colorado, testified before the Senate Committee as a spokesman for the American Council on Education. Dr. McKean was also chairman in 1958 of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, an organization with a membership of 100 graduate schools. He referred to the estimates that as many as 270,000 additional college teachers would be needed in the next 20 years. The Western

¹⁶ House hearings, op. cit., pp. 856-69, and Senate hearings, op. cit., pp. 363-76.

¹⁷ Senate hearings, op. cit., p. 89.

Interstate Commission for Higher Education, he reported, had estimated that by 1965 the 11 Western States alone would require 10,000 additional teachers.¹⁸ He said he personally felt that, considering there were 280,000 students in the graduate schools, a program of 1,000 or 1,500 graduate fellowships a year would not make "any big splash in the ocean of need," and that a Federal program that began with 10,000 fellowships a year would be more realistic. When queried by Senator Hill as to why then the American Council was recommending only 1,000 to 1,500 fellowships a year, Dr. McKean replied that the Council's recommendation was simply the acceptance of the number offered in the principal bills being considered by the Committee.

An inadequate future supply of college teachers in the field of engineering was considered to be especially critical by the engineering profession. Speaking as President of the American Society for Engineering Education, Frederick C. Lindvall, who was also Chairman of the Division of Engineering at the California Institute of Technology, testified that it would be necessary to recruit approximately 9,600 teachers for engineering colleges by 1967 to absorb an anticipated 76 percent increase in the number of faculty plus the normal vacancies caused by resignations and retirements. He referred to a study in 1956-57 in which engineering deans reported a total of 9,800 budgeted engineering faculty positions, of which only a little over 8,500 were adequately filled. Thirteen percent of the positions were either vacant (7.5 percent) or filled with temporary part-time or unsatisfactory personnel (5.5 percent). Dr. Lindvall feared further erosion in faculty quality unless corrective steps were taken.

Fellowship Distribution Among Institutions

Among the witnesses there appeared to be preference for the administration bill which provided that fellowships be awarded through graduate schools rather than directly, as in the Committee bill, to the individual who would then choose a graduate school, provided it would admit him. The American Council on Education, the American Psychological Association, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science favored this approach. Lawrence H. Snyder, President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science and Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Oklahoma, pointed out that the National Science Foundation already had an excellent program of fellowships in the sciences under which fellows could enroll in any university that accepted them. The provisions of the administration bill, he reasoned, would contribute more effectively to the building up of additional graduate education opportunities of high quality all over the Nation than would the fellowship plans of the Committee bill.¹⁹ Dr. McKean of the American Council feared that fellowship winners under the Committee bill would tend to congregate at a few prestigious institutions and thus "make the rich richer and the poor poorer."

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 390.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 552.

Dr. Ralph A. Morgen, Director, Purdue Research Foundation, testified that fellowships in engineering were at that time going to only 10 or 15 institutions although there were 67 institutions in the country that offered the Ph. D. program in engineering. He strongly urged that under the new program fellowships be allocated to 60 or 65 institutions.²⁰

John T. Caldwell, President of the University of Arkansas, speaking on behalf of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities (now known as the National Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities), recommended a modified approach to the distribution problem. He would assign some of the fellowships to institutions to be awarded through them to the students while the remainder would be awarded directly to students who would select the graduate schools they wished to attend. Graduate schools throughout the Nation needed strengthening, he said, and it was necessary to apply corrective measures to the then-existing tendency to concentrate qualified students and Federal support in a few institutions.²¹

Fellowships for All Fields of Study

There appeared to be a general feeling on the part of witnesses that fellowships should be made available in all fields of study leading to the doctorate rather than being restricted to a few special fields. It is interesting that some of the strongest support for this point of view came from the scientific community.

Among those recommending this were Dr. Snyder of the American Association for the Advancement of Science;²² Dr. Caldwell of the Land-Grant Association, who testified that distinguished scientists and engineers who helped formulate the American Council's recommendations were unanimous in opposing restriction of fellowships to the natural sciences;²³ and Roger W. Russell, Executive Secretary, American Psychological Association, who said his Association strongly favored that fellowships be awarded in all fields of study.²⁴

Amount of Fellowship Stipend

A number of witnesses preferred the stipend provision of the administration bill, which provided for flexibility of stipends to correspond to real financial need in contradistinction to the Committee bill which provided for inflexible stipends in the \$2,000 to \$2,400 range. The American Psychological Association favored the former approach, as did the American Council on Education, which recommended a ceiling of \$2,000 a year for a single student and \$3,000 a year for a married student.

Dr. Caldwell of the Land-Grant Association pointed out that most of the current fellowship holders were holding

²⁰ Ibid., p. 819.

²¹ Ibid., p. 684.

²² Ibid., p. 553.

²³ Ibid., p. 684.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 765.

some kind of a graduate assistant assignment and were serving the institution in an instructional capacity. He feared that if the fellowship stipend was made so attractive to a graduate student that he didn't have to do any teaching and there was no requirement on that, then the institution's instructional costs in certain courses would go up considerably, creating a financial problem for the institution.

Desirability of Requiring Some Teaching by Fellows

Alden H. Emery, Executive Secretary of the American Chemical Society, was one of several witnesses who urged that some teaching be required of fellowship holders. He stated that although the bills being considered didn't exclude the possibility of part-time teaching, few students would elect to teach if their stipends were adequate. He noted that this was generally the case in fellowship programs which had existed up to that time. He pointed out that in the field of science it was common practice to employ graduate students to assist in undergraduate laboratory instruction and examination grading and, occasionally, in the case of those with unusual teaching ability, to teach recitation sections. He said the Society considered teaching and assisting experience to be a very valuable part of graduate training.²⁵ The Society recommended that either (1) first-year graduate students be eliminated from consideration for fellowships or (2) that students who received fellowships be required to perform some specified amount of teaching if requested.

Institutional Support and Attributable Costs

Witnesses were unanimous in favoring financial assistance to institutions in support of graduate education through Federal fellowships. As discussed earlier, both the administration bill and the Committee bill provided for some support. The witnesses tended, however, to be against the "attributable costs" provision contained in the Committee bill, and favored instead a flat sum to be uniformly applied. The American Council on Education recommended that an institution should receive each year a cost-of-education payment of \$1,000 for each graduate student holding a fellowship.

Speaking on behalf of the Council, Dr. McKean asserted that it was impossible to separate undergraduate and graduate costs. He said that universities were not organized, or even organizable, to provide answers to such accounting questions, and having such a provision in the law would lead to endless bickering.

Dr. Caldwell of the Land-Grant Association urged that if the 50-50 matching provision of the administration bill should be adopted it be deferred for at least a year and not exceed 25 percent for the first year. Public universities, he said, received new funds for matching largely from their legislatures, and either the legislatures were not in session or would likely be adjourned before the bills reached them. He also believed that private universities would encounter

difficulty in raising the matching money on such short notice.²⁶

Revised House Bill Emerges as Result of Committee Hearings

Following the conclusion of the public hearings on March 13 and April 3, respectively, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the House Subcommittee on Special Education undertook the task of drafting revised bills as a consequence of the hearings. Representative Carl Elliott introduced the first such bill, H.R. 13247, in the House on July 1, 1958. On that same day, bills identical to that of Mr. Elliott were introduced in the House as follows: H.R. 13248 by Representative Stuyvesant Wainwright, Republican of New York; H.R. 13249 by Representative Cleveland M. Bailey, Democrat of West Virginia; and H.R. 13250 by Representative Harry G. Haskell, Jr., Republican of Delaware. It should be noted that two Democrats and two Republicans introduced the identical bills, thus indicating bipartisan support. All four bills (only H.R. 13247 was actually printed) were referred to the House Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 13247 was considered as the principal bill of the four identical bills and was referred to by this number in all the legislation which followed.

H.R. 13247 had a much shorter preamble than its predecessor, H.R. 10381, introduced by Mr. Elliott on January 30. It simply stated that the bill was designed "to strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs; and for other purposes." As before, it was to be cited, if enacted, as the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Comparison of Fellowship Provisions of New and Old House Bills

In comparing the new bill, H.R. 13247, with the earlier bill, H.R. 10381, title VII, "National Defense Fellowships" of H.R. 10381, was replaced by title VI, "Expansion of Graduate Education" of H.R. 13247. The authorized number of fellowships for the first fiscal year remained the same—1,000 fellowships. The new bill provided for 1,500 fellowships for each of the 3 succeeding fiscal years, whereas the old bill provided 1,500 fellowships for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. The stipend provisions for fellows and their dependents remained unchanged. The main differences between the new bill and the old bill were as follows:

1. H.R. 10381 provided that the National Advisory Council on Science and Education was to advise and assist the Commissioner of Education in the administration of the fellowship program. This provision was not included in H.R. 13247.

2. H.R. 13247 specifically required the Commissioner to approve fellowship programs in institutions only when such programs: (a) were new or expansions of existing programs;

²⁵ Ibid., p. 1007-08.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 686.

(b) tended to promote wider geographical distribution of graduate facilities around the Nation; and (c) gave preference to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education. These provisions were not included in H.R. 10381.

3. H.R. 13247 provided that payment to an institution for attributable costs for the education of each fellow be not less than \$500 nor more than \$2,500 per academic year. H.R. 10381 simply provided that payment not exceed \$1,000 per academic year per fellowship.

After executive sessions, the House Committee on Education and Labor, on July 15, under the chairmanship of Representative Graham A. Barden, Democrat of North Carolina, reported H.R. 13247 favorably without amendment and recommended by a vote of 23 to 2 to the Whole House that the bill be passed.²⁷

Revised Senate Bill Emerges as Result of Committee Hearings

On August 5, Senator Lister Hill introduced the revised Senate bill, S. 4237, for himself and 29 other Senators (24 Democrats and five Republicans). The preamble was identical to his earlier bill, S. 3187, introduced on January 30. As in the earlier bill, this measure, if enacted, was to be cited as the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Title VII, "National Defense Fellowships," of the earlier bill became title VI, "National Defense Fellowships," of S. 4237.

Comparison of Fellowship Provisions of New and Old Senate Bills

There were a number of differences between the provisions of the new bill and the old bill. Both bills authorized 1,000 fellowships to be awarded during the first fiscal year, but whereas S. 3187 authorized 1,500 fellowships to be awarded during each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years, the new bill, S. 4237, authorized that the number be awarded during each of 3 succeeding fiscal years. As in the new companion House bill, H.R. 13247, awards were now restricted to approved programs which were new or expanded, which achieved greater geographical distribution, and which gave preference to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

The old bill provided for fellowship stipends of \$2,000 for the first academic year, \$2,200 for the second, and \$2,400 for the third year, plus a \$400 yearly allowance for each dependent. The new bill allowed the same amounts of money, but a successful amendment offered in committee by Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, required one-half of these amounts to be in the form of grants and the other half in the form of loans having interest at the rate of 2 percent per annum from the date when repayment would begin. The loan would be repayable over a 10-year period, beginning one year after the borrower ceased to pursue a full-time course of study at an

institution of higher education. The loan portion could be cancelled at the rate of 20 percent per year by teaching in an institution of higher education. Also, whereas the old bill in effect offered institutional support up to \$1,000 a year for each fellow for actual costs, the new bill allowed up to \$2,500.

There was an additional provision in the new bill. This provision was the disclaimer affidavit and loyalty oath, Subsection (f) of Section 1201, which had been inserted into the measure by Senator H. Alexander Smith.²⁸ The wording of this provision, which received little notice during floor consideration of NDEA legislation but which was later to become a center of controversy, was as follows:

(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments under any scholarship, fellowship, or grant to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic." The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such affidavits.

Floor Action in the House

On August 6, the House Committee on Rules reported favorably to the House on enabling resolution H.R. 675, providing for consideration of H.R. 13247 by the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. The resolution allowed general debate confined to the bill, the debate not to exceed 2 hours and to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. The resolution was adopted by the House on August 7 by a vote of 266 to 108 and was immediately taken up for consideration.

There was no debate on the fellowships title. The only change in this title was an amendment by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat of New York, that fellowships would be awarded "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin or sex." This amendment, which was also to apply to the scholarship and loan sections of the bill, had appeared in several other pieces of legislation and had become popularly known as "The Powell Amendment."

The main debate concerned the undergraduate scholar-

²⁷ Report No. 2157. House. 85th Congress, 2d Session. July 15, 1958.

²⁸ "Federal Role in Education." *Congressional Quarterly Service*. Washington: Spring 1959. p. 27.

ship title (title II) of the bill. The bill provided for approximately 23,000 scholarships. After a successful amendment by Representative Carroll D. Kearns, Republican of Pennsylvania, reducing the authorized appropriation so as to provide about 10,000 scholarships instead of 23,000, an amendment offered by Representative Walter H. Judd, Republican of Minnesota, to delete entirely the scholarship provision of the bill was approved by a vote of 109 to 78. With the deletion of title II, remaining titles were renumbered accordingly and title VI, "Expansion of Graduate Education," became title V of H.R. 13247, as amended. At the conclusion of the debate, a motion by Representative Ralph W. Gwinn, Republican of New York, to recommit the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor was defeated by a vote of 140 to 233. The bill was then immediately passed by a voice vote.

Floor Action in the Senate

On August 8, 1958, S. 4237 was reported to the Senate, without amendments, by Chairman Lister Hill.²⁹ On August 11, H.R. 13247 was received in the Senate, read twice, and ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

On August 13 the Senate commenced consideration of S. 4237. With congressional elections coming up in November of that year, the Congress was driving to finish up its business by meeting early and late and on Saturdays so that it could adjourn by the end of August. Thus the Senate convened early (10 a.m. instead of 12 noon as usual) on August 13 and continued in session until shortly after midnight with most of the time devoted to debating S. 4237.

In their remarks opening the debate, both the ranking majority member and the ranking minority member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee stressed the importance of the bill to national defense. Said Chairman Hill:

"In reporting S. 4237 to the Senate the Committee has approved a coordinated program for strengthening the national defense through an interrelated set of proposals designed to assist State, local, and private effort to develop America's brainpower for defense, by stimulating students, teachers, parents, and school authorities to seek the highest possible attainment in learning."³⁰

Senator H. Alexander Smith, ranking minority member of the Committee, had this to say:

"In this first year of the space age, the interests of national security require that the more effective mobilization of our national brainpower should receive the top priority for Federal action in the field of education."³¹

Although there was resistance to the bill itself by a minority of Senators who disfavored Federal aid to education, there was no expression of opposition to the fellowship program and no debate over its provisions. The main debate took place over a school construction assistance

amendment offered by Senator Patrick V. McNamara, Democrat of Michigan, for himself and 13 other Senators and an amendment offered by Senator John Sherman Cooper to reduce the total amount of money authorized for scholarship awards as well as the size of scholarship stipend from \$500 a year to \$250. The McNamara amendment was defeated and the Cooper amendment accepted.

After all amendments to S. 4237 were disposed of, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of H.R. 13247. Under an order previously entered, the presiding officer announced that the House bill was deemed to be amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of S. 4237, as amended. In effect, of course, although still called H.R. 13247, H.R. 13247 was replaced by S. 4237, as amended. H.R. 13247, as amended, was then passed near mid-night by a vote of 62 to 26.

Just before the final vote was taken, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson, Senate Majority Leader and later to become 36th President of the United States, praised the Labor and Welfare Committee and its chairman for producing what he considered an outstanding piece of legislation and he concluded the floor discussion of the bill with these remarks:

"Security consists of people who are alert, people who are vigilant, and people who are trained to cope with the tremendous problems of the modern world.

"We cannot cope with these problems unless we have men skilled in physics, chemistry, mathematics, astronomy, and all of the natural sciences, but neither can we cope with them if our training is solely in the natural sciences.

"We look for citizens who are broadguaged, who understand the workings of our system, who are conscious of the great heritage of our culture. We need men and women who understand Aristotle as well as Darwin, who are as familiar with Shakespeare as they are with Einstein and Newton. The time may come when we will have to take up arms once again to defend our heritage. But we must know what it is that we are defending, and even more important we must know the kind of world which we wish to extend and create so that our descendants can live in peace and progress.

"Mr. President, this measure is an important step in that direction. It is only the first step but, as such, it is an historic landmark and the Nation owes a debt of eternal gratitude to those who contributed to its achievement."³²

Conference on H.R. 13247

After the Senate had passed its amended version of H.R. 13247 and sent it back to the House, the House voted on August 14 to disagree with the Senate amendment and ask for a conference. The Speaker of the House appointed as conferees four Democrats and three Republicans.³³ Upon

²⁹ Ibid., pp. 17330-31.

³⁰ Report No. 2242. Senate, 85th Congress, 2d Session.

³¹ Congressional Record, Vol. 104, Part 13, 85th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958. p. 17234.

³² Ibid., p. 17236.

³³ The Democrats were Representatives Graham A. Barden of North Carolina, Cleveland M. Bailey of West Virginia, Carl Elliott of Alabama, and Lee Metcalf of Montana. The Republicans were Representatives Ralph W. Gwinn of New York, Carroll D. Kearns of Pennsylvania, and Harry G. Haskell, Jr., of Delaware.

receiving the message from the House announcing its disagreement with the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 13247, the Senate voted to agree to the request of the House for a conference and the Chair appointed three Democrats and two Republicans as conferees on the part of the Senate.³⁴ The conferees had four meetings in 3 long, hard days of conference, and issued their conference report on August 21.³⁵

In the conference report, the fellowships title became title IV. Except for a few minor points, the House version of fellowships was the one which was adopted. The only differences between the conference agreement and H.R. 13247 as originally passed by the House were:

1. The name of the title was changed from "Expansion of Graduate Education" to "National Defense Fellowships" as in the Senate amendment.

2. The clause "without discrimination based upon race, color, religion, national origin or sex" in the provision on the award of fellowships was dropped. The Senate version did not have such a clause.

3. H.R. 13247 as originally passed by the House required that the amount paid to an institution for institutional costs in the education of each graduate student be not less than \$500 nor more than \$2,500 per academic year. The conference report put no lower limit on the payment but simply specified that the institution could not be paid more than \$2,500.

The conference report authorized the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, to appoint an advisory committee or committees, to advise and consult with him with respect to the administration of the provisions of NDEA for which he was responsible.³⁶ Any such committee was to consist of 12 members as follows:

1. Four members who were recognized scholars in engineering, mathematics, or science.

2. Four members who were recognized scholars in any of the fields of the humanities.

3. Four members from such fields of endeavor as the Commissioner deemed appropriate.

The conference report provisions on advisory committees was a compromise in the provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment to it. H.R. 13247 permitted the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, to appoint an advisory committee or committees to advise and consult with him in respect to the administration of the title dealing with language development, the expansion of graduate education, and research and experimentation in the more effective use of media for educational purposes. Nothing was said in this House bill on committee membership. The Senate amendment to the House bill provided

for just one committee, a National Advisory Council on Science and Education, with 12 members distributed as explained above in the conference report.

The major difference in the House-passed bill and the Senate amendment to it was the title in the Senate amendment for undergraduate scholarships, a title which had been deleted from the House bill. The House conferees prevailed and the conference report came out with no provision for scholarships.

The Senate amendment to H.R. 13247 had added a disclaimer affidavit and an oath of allegiance as a requirement for all individuals who received payments or loans under the authority of the act. In the conference, the House conferees agreed to the retention of this provision, which, as mentioned before, was later to become a center of controversy in regard to fellowships and loans.

Final Floor Action

The Senate and the House took up final floor action on the conference report on H.R. 13247 on August 22 and 23, respectively. In answers to questions from Members, managers of both bodies explained how agreements had been reached. In the House, for instance, two Members asked why the antidiscrimination amendment, which had been passed by the House, had been dropped in the conference report. Mr. Elliott explained that the conferees had considered the language unnecessary in view of the letter of August 19, 1958, to him from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That letter, Mr. Elliott said, made it clear that "the basis for the award of loans and fellowships would be the same without, as with, the antidiscrimination provisions."³⁷

In answer to a question on the cost of the bill, Mr. Elliott estimated the 4-year figure to be \$887 million, of which \$266 million would be repaid under the loan provisions. This totaled out, he said, to \$621 million, or an average annual cost of slightly more than \$155 million.³⁸

Much of the final discussion in both Chambers was taken over by oratory praising Senator Hill and Representative Elliott for originating the legislation, gaining bipartisan support for it, and guiding it to a successful conclusion. Senator J. W. Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, called Senator Hill's accomplishment "a great service to the country." Representative Carl Albert, Democrat of Oklahoma, lauded Carl Elliott with these words:

"The gentleman who has been the architect of this measure is to be commended by the House not only for the job done in conference, but for the very fine bill which bears his name. This is unquestionably one of the landmarks in American statutory law. It may well be the greatest single achievement of the 85th Congress."³⁹

There was a sense of history in the making on the day of passage of the bill. Representative Walter H. Judd stated

³⁴ The Democrats were Senators Lister Hill of Alabama, Patrick V. McNamara of Michigan, and Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas. The Republicans were Senators H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey and Gordon L. Allott of Colorado.

³⁵ Report No. 2688. House. 85th Congress, 2d Session.

³⁶ This provision gave authority for the establishment of the Title IV Advisory Committee which functioned during the entire 10 years covered by this report.

³⁷ Congressional Record. Vol. 104, Part 15. 85th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958. p. 19596

³⁸ Ibid., p. 19611.

³⁹ Ibid., p. 19596.

that "it unquestionably represents a landmark in the history of education." Representative Henry A. Dixon, Republican of Utah, said that "August 23, 1958, will go down in history as the beginning of a new educational awakening in America."⁴⁰ Senator Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat of Texas, said that the Act "is the most advanced step since the Land Grant College Act of the 1860's."⁴¹

Several speakers stated that the act would do much toward meeting the challenge of Sputnik and Soviet education, a challenge which unquestionably had had much to do with its passage. Representative George S. McGovern, Democrat of South Dakota, who felt that the graduate fellowship title was perhaps the most valuable feature of the bill, declared that "first and foremost, it represents at least one significant answer to the educational challenge of communism."⁴² Although recognizing that to a large measure the act was a response to the new Soviet achievements in science, several speakers urged that the social sciences and humanities not be neglected, that the new legislation be broadly administered within the American tradition of educating the whole man.

The Senate passed the conference report on August 22 by a vote of 66 to 15. The House accepted the conference report the next day by a vote of 212 to 85, thus sending the measure to the President for his signature.

National Defense Education Act of 1958 Becomes Law

Upon signing into law H. R. 13247, President Dwight D. Eisenhower released this statement at the U.S. Naval Base, Newport, R.I., on September 2, 1958:

"I have today signed into law H.R. 13247, the National Defense Education Act.

"This Act, which is an emergency undertaking to be terminated after four years, will in that time do much to strengthen our American system of education so that it can meet the broad and increasing demands imposed upon it by considerations of basic national security.

"While the Congress did not see fit to provide a limited number of National Defense scholarships which I recommended as an incentive to our most promising youth, I consider this Act to be a sound and constructive piece of legislation.

"Much remains to be done to bring American education to levels consistent with the needs of our society. The Federal Government having done its share, the people of the country, working through their local and State governments and through private agencies, must now redouble their efforts toward this end."⁴³

Upon the signing, H.R. 13247 had ended its odyssey through the 85th Congress and had become Public Law

85-864. The exact provisions of title IV of this law, "National Defense Fellowships," were as follows:

Public Law 85-864

TITLE IV— NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 402. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the Commissioner is authorized to award one thousand fellowships under the provisions of this title, and during each of the three succeeding fiscal years he is authorized to award one thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships shall be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 403. (a) The Commissioner shall award fellowships under this title to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by him under this section. The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded.

(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

(3) that in the acceptance of persons for study in such programs preference will be given to persons interested in teaching in institutions of higher education.

(b) The total of the fellowships awarded under this title for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2).

FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

SEC. 404. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, \$2,200 for the second year, and \$2,400 for the third such year plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each of his dependents.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study such amount, not more than \$2,500 per academic year, as is determined by the Commissioner to constitute that portion of the cost of the new graduate program or of the expansion in an existing graduate program in which such person is pursuing his course of study, which is reasonably attributable to him.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

⁴⁰ Ibid., p. 19597.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 19085.

⁴² Ibid., p. 19615.

⁴³ *Public Papers of the Presidents*, op. cit., p. 244.

CHAPTER III

implementation of title IV and first year of operation

The signing into law on September 2 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was the signal for U.S. Commissioner Lawrence G. Derthick to spring into action to implement the measure. Of course, if no funds had been appropriated to go along with the act, it would have been possible to do only planning, with the aid of existing Office of Education staff. Fortunately, Congress provided an appropriation which became immediately available.

During the final days before NDEA was passed, an estimate of \$117,200,000 for implementation of the act and \$2,100,000 for Office of Education salaries and expenses to administer the first year of operation had been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. When it became apparent that there would, in fact, be a National Defense Education Act, the Office of Education, through the Department, made an urgent request to Representative John E. Fogarty, Democrat of Rhode Island, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, for funds to become accessible at once in case the pending bill, H.R. 13247,

should be enacted into law. This request came too late, however, for the House Appropriations Committee to consider it, as the Committee had completed action on all appropriations. The request, therefore, was sent over to the Senate Appropriations Committee which was considering H.R. 13856, the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill—a measure which had been introduced in the House to replace an earlier bill, H.R. 11574, which had passed Congress but had been vetoed by the President on August 4, 1958.

In presenting the Independent Offices Appropriation Bill for final action on the Senate floor on August 23, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, explained why a new title IV had been added which provided supplemental appropriations for several departments and agencies, including Defense Educational Activities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"In Title IV of the Bill, the committee had recommended additional supplemental estimates for several departments and agencies in the amount of \$110,052,000 as compared to

estimates totaling \$244,210,000. Most of these requests were supplemental estimates, sent to the House as well as to the Senate, and are authorized by legislation passed this week. In considering these estimates, the committee determined which items are urgently needed and which items can be deferred until the next Congress, and recommended a scaling down of the estimates accordingly. It was necessary for the items to be handled in this manner because the House Committee had determined that no other appropriation bills would be initiated.

"The amounts I have stated are those which will have to be maintained. The several Chairmen of the other subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee sat in on the deliberations yesterday. Although these items technically are not part of the Independent Offices Appropriations Bill—for they belong in the Appropriations bills for other departments—yet it is necessary under the circumstances, that the items be considered at this time, in connection with this measure."¹

First Supplemental Appropriation Passes

The Senate accepted the recommendation of its Appropriations Committee and a new title IV was added to the House-passed bill H.R. 13856, providing for \$53,300,000 for funding the provisions of the act and \$750,000 for Office of Education salaries and expenses with which to administer it. When the amended bill was taken up on the House floor later in the day of August 23, Representative Albert Thomas, Democrat of Texas, moved that the Senate amendments of their bill be accepted, except that the amendment providing for \$53,300,000 for Defense Educational Activities be further amended by the House to provide \$40,000,000 instead of \$53,300,000, with amounts earmarked for special programs being adjusted in proportion to the new total.² The House passed Mr. Thomas' motion and later in the day the Senate voted, on motion by Senator Magnuson, to concur with the House on the Defense Educational Activities appropriation, thus sending the bill to the President for signature. President Eisenhower affixed his signature on August 28, 1958, thereby creating Public Law 85-844. There was, of course, a provision in Public Law 85-844 that the \$40,000,000 appropriation for Defense Education Activities and the \$750,000 for salaries and expenses related thereto were contingent upon the enactment of NDEA.

Of the \$40,000,000 supplemental appropriated, \$35,500,000 was, by law, earmarked for specific titles of NDEA. Funds for the graduate fellowship title were not earmarked and hence had to come out of the remaining \$4,500,000. Soon after Public Law 85-844 became effective, the Office of Education decided to allocate from that amount \$800,000 to the fellowship program in order to get it started. There was a general understanding that the \$40,000,000 appropriation was an interim appropriation only, and that as soon

as the 86th Congress convened a new request would be made for the remainder of the supplemental which the 85th Congress had denied.

Early Steps Taken to Implement Title IV

Commissioner Derthick lost no time in implementing the higher education titles of NDEA. In early September he established a Financial Aid Branch in the Division of Higher Education. One of the sections created within the new Branch was the Graduate Fellowship Section.³

Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., who was an assistant to Secretary Marion B. Folsom of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was immediately recruited to become Director of the new Financial Aid Branch. Ward S. Stewart and James H. Blessing of the Division of Higher Education were detailed to assist Dr. Babbidge with getting the graduate fellowship program under way until a regular staff could be employed. Dr. Stewart served as Acting Chief of the new Graduate Fellowship Section.

A number of policy and procedural questions had to be resolved very soon. Of course, there were constraints imposed by the very wording of the act. In fact, some persons wished that some of the provisions of title IV had been written differently. Here is the way Ralph A. Sawyer, Dean of the School of Graduate Studies of the University of Michigan, expressed it in speaking to the October 1958 Chicago meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities:

"The Bill that was passed was somewhat of a compromise. The compromise, I think, was written rather hastily, and if the people who did it had had more time, they might have produced something a little easier to interpret and administer."⁴

On September 19, 1958, after the passage of NDEA, a group of 12 selected persons, mostly graduate deans, were invited to Washington to advise Office of Education staff on policy formulation in implementing the graduate fellowship program.⁵ One of the deans was J. P. Elder of the

³ The three other sections of the new branch were: Student Loan Section; Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes Section; and Language Development Section.

⁴ J. P. Elder and Ralph A. Sawyer. "Report on Provisions of the 1958 National Defense Education Act." With discussion. In *Association of Graduate Schools Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, 10th Annual Conference, 1958, p. 5.

⁵ The conferees were: Leonard B. Beach, Dean of the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., and President of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities; Harry Alpert, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Oregon, Eugene; J. P. Elder, Dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Lewis M. Hammond, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Virginia, Charlottesville; Robert Lester, Executive Director, Southern Fellowship Fund, Chapel Hill, N.C.; Walter E. Lochwing, Dean of the Graduate School, State University of Iowa, Iowa City; Robert M. Lumiansky, Dean of the Graduate School, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.; Robert W. MacVicar, Dean of the Graduate School, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater; Carl J. Rees, Provost and Dean of the Graduate School, University of Delaware, Newark; John O. Riedl, Dean of the Graduate School, Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., and Chairman of the

¹ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 104, Part 15, 85th Congress, 2d Session, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, p. 19433.

² *Ibid.*, p. 19671.

Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Harvard University, who, it will be recalled from chapter I, conducted the research study of doctorate recipients at Harvard University and Radcliffe College between 1950 and 1954. Dean Elder, a classicist, was persuaded to come to Washington for a few months and become the first Chief of the Graduate Fellowship Program. He officially assumed his duties on November 10 and stayed until the middle of April 1959. By the middle of December the recruitment of a staff of professionals—John L. Chase, Muriel Greenhill, Florence E. Roache, Robert M. Rosenzweig and Robert E. Turvene—permitted first Dr. Stewart and a few months later Dr. Blessing to return to their regular positions in the Higher Education Programs Branch of the Division of Higher Education.

Policies Established Pertaining to Institutions and Administration of Program

A number of very important policy decisions with regard to the operation of the program soon took shape.

Advisory Committees

One of the first tasks was that of establishing a formal advisory committee for the graduate fellowship program. As pointed out earlier, Section 1002 of title X, "Miscellaneous Provisions," of NDEA permitted the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appoint an advisory committee or committees to consult with him with respect to the administration of the act. Any such committee was to consist of exactly 12 persons. In order to bring to the committee from year to year new ideas and viewpoints, it was decided that one third of the members should be rotated off the committee each year and replaced by new members. Hence, during the first 2 years of the program some committee members would serve only a year or 2, but all new members were to be appointed with the intent that they serve on a committee for 3 years.

"Borrowed Graduate Dean" Concept

It was felt that the administration of the graduate fellowship program would be strengthened by having as its chief a person who knew first-hand all the facets of graduate school operation. The best way to accomplish this, it was decided, was to annually invite a different graduate dean to serve 1 year in the post. This would assure an influx of new ideas and insights into the program.

Institutions to Select Fellows

It was important to settle early the question of how the fellowships would be awarded. NDEA was not specific on

this point. If it wished to do so, the Office of Education could select fellowship winners. The decision was made, however, to have institutions submit applications for specific doctoral programs, specifying the number of fellowships requested for each program as well as the minimum number they would accept in the event the requested number could not be granted. In no case would more than 50 fellowships be allocated to any one institution. This system of awarding the fellowships, it was felt, most properly carried out the legislation's intent of wide geographical distribution.

Once a program had been approved and officially announced, students would submit applications to the participating institutions, not the Office of Education. The institutions would then select nominees from among the applicants and submit their names, along with the names of about half as many alternates in case principal nominees could not or did not accept, to the Commissioner of Education who actually made the fellowship awards.

Forward Financing

A fourth important decision made was that fellowships would be awarded and funds obligated during one fiscal year for expenditure during the succeeding fiscal year—e.g., funds appropriated during fiscal year 1959 would be obligated during fiscal year 1959 and expended during fiscal year 1960. This was an essential decision and was described as "forward financing." What it meant, of course, was that a fellow had to be actually appointed and funds obligated by June 30 of the fiscal year preceding his study or the funds, and therefore the authorized fellowship, would be irretrievably lost.

Preference to Small and Medium-Size Institutions

In order to promote wider distribution of graduate facilities as called for by the act, it was decided that, in approval of applications, preference would be given to small and medium-size institutions over large traditional centers of graduate training. Dean Elder told the graduate deans at the 1958 Chicago meeting:

"I might just as well say at this point that we should disabuse ourselves of two ideas. First, this Act was not drawn up for the special benefit of Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Chicago, Michigan or Berkeley and the like. I take very seriously the geographical aspect of this Act. Indeed, it is that aspect which has probably more than anything else moved me to take on this assignment."⁶

As evidence of his sincerity, no application for fellowships was submitted by his own university.

All Fields of Graduate Study to be Eligible for Fellowships

No preference would be given to any field of study. It was thought by some that, NDEA being a "national defense act," preference might be given to fields such as science and

Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research; Ralph A. Sawyer, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Herman E. Spivey, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

⁶ "Report on Provisions of the 1958 National Defense Education Act," op. cit., p. 8.

engineering which could be immediately related to military activities. But the policymakers adopted the broader view that all branches of learning contribute to the Nation's strength and therefore to its defense. The social sciences and the humanities were considered just as essential as the "hard" sciences.

Criteria for New and Expanded Programs

In general, a "new" program was one which the proposers had been considering but had not yet established. In addition, to qualify, the institution had to be legally authorized by July 1, 1959, to grant the Ph. D. or equivalent degree in the field of its proposed program.

"Expansion" required increased enrollment of students as well as expansion of facilities or some sort of increase in teaching staff. For example, if an institution were to take on additional instructors or teaching assistants who would free professors for more time for their graduate students, this would constitute a valid increase.

Attributable Costs

Institutions were asked to determine, as best they could, the cost reasonably attributable to each fellow in the establishing of a new program or the expanding of an existing one. In making applications, institutions were to figure this amount in the fashion that seemed right to them. Some time later in February or March, after the programs had been approved, more precise regulations were to be issued on how to determine this amount. These regulations would have to be agreed upon by the Office of Education and its legal counsel and the appropriate governmental fiscal authorities.⁷

Any tuition and fees collected from the student had to be deducted from this cost in arriving at a request for payment. And in no case could it exceed \$2,500 for each fellow.

Policies and Regulations Pertaining to Students

Fellowships to be Limited to those Pursuing a Ph. D. or Similar Degree

A decision had to be made as to who would be eligible for the fellowships. The act required that preference be given to persons interested in college teaching, but it did not specify that the fellowship recipient have as his or her goal a Ph. D. or equivalent degree. The chief-designate of the fellowship program, Dean Elder, made his views known on this matter at the October 1958 meeting of the deans of the Association of Graduate Schools:

"I would argue that in this first year we should limit the fellowships to Ph. D. candidates on these grounds. First, that it is a first and experimental year. Second, that the Ph. D. is our highest degree, and we ought to put our best foot

forward and aim at what we consider the supreme degree. Further, there is, I think, more uniformity of quality in Ph. D. programs than there is in Master programs throughout the country. When I speak of 'Ph. D.' I include equivalent degrees.

"Finally, I would appeal to that legal principle known as 'legislative intent,' pointing out that Congress has allocated these fellowships for three years, and if we, as I hope we do, consider that nobody ought to take three years for their Master's degree, the legislative intent, and indeed all I can find out about the history of the Act as it went through Congressional committees, would seem to indicate that Congress had very much in mind the Doctor's degree."⁸

In the first general announcement issued in 1958 on the National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program it was stated that a student, in order to be eligible for a fellowship, had to state that he intended to enroll in a full-time course of study leading to the Ph. D. or equivalent degree. During the 3-year period of the fellowship, however, a fellow would be permitted to pursue a master's degree while en route to the higher degree.

Fellowship Awards to be Limited to First-Year Graduate Students

One early policy decision caused considerable bitterness among some advanced graduate students. This was the ruling that fellowships scheduled to begin in the fall of 1959 would be awarded to first-year graduate students only. A student could have completed no more than a half year of graduate study prior to entering on the fellowship. The language of the act itself necessitated this policy determination because it provided a specific stipend (\$2,000) for the first academic year of study after the baccalaureate degree, a specific stipend (\$2,200) for the second year, and a specific stipend (\$2,400) for the third year. Thus, for example, only a third-year fellowship—with, of course, the third-year stipend—could be awarded to a person who already had completed 2 years of graduate work. This would mean that the first 2 years of that fellowship would be irrevocably lost.

Limited Teaching by Fellows to be Permitted

Since the principal reason that title IV was included in NDEA was to increase the Nation's supply of qualified college teachers, a certain amount of teaching or research by a graduate student was permitted by the act. It was considered desirable as long as, in the words of Dean Elder, it "will lead him into the process but won't kill him in the act of it."⁹ For this reason, the first general announcement of the graduate fellowship program stated that a fellow could be employed during the academic year by his institu-

⁷"Report on Provisions of the 1958 National Defense Education Act," op. cit., p. 10-11.

⁹*Administration of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. 86th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. p. 107.*

⁷Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. "Higher Education and the National Defense Education Act." *Phi Delta Kappan* (40:5). February 1959. p. 203.

tion in teaching or research up to one-fourth time during 1 of the 3 years of the fellowship or up to one-half time during one semester, and that he could receive payment for such work. By the language of the act, this was the only kind of gainful employment permitted during the academic year. The fellow could also receive additional scholarship or other aid from his institution but could not simultaneously receive any other Federal educational assistance, not even loans under title II of NDEA.

Additional Regulations

There were these additional regulations pertaining to a fellow:

- (1) A fellow must be a national of the United States or be in the United States for other than a temporary purpose.
- (2) A fellow must have completed the baccalaureate degree or its equivalent.
- (3) An institution was permitted to charge a fellow tuition and fees, if it so desired. If it did so, however, as mentioned before, it must subtract the amount of such fees and tuition from the cost per student in determining the cost of a new graduate program or the expansion of an existing one.

Regional Briefing Meetings Held

In late fall of 1958 the Financial Aid Branch conducted a series of 10 regional meetings to brief interested higher education administrators and faculty members on the higher education titles of NDEA, including the graduate fellowship program. Popularly referred to by Office of Education personnel as "road shows," these meetings were held in the following cities: Washington, New York, Boston, Chicago, Kansas City, Louisville, Portland (Oreg.), San Francisco, Denver, and Dallas.

Guidelines Given for Applications

Late in November of 1958, the Office of Education sent to all graduate schools an announcement titled "Information for the Academic Year 1959-60," giving regulations and policies as well as instructions on how to prepare an application. Necessary forms were included. The announcement contained the following tentative calendar of target dates:

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| December 31, 1958: | Institutional applications due at the U.S. Office of Education. |
| February 1, 1959: | Action on institutional applications. |
| February 5, 1959: | Public announcement of approved programs. Institutions may begin forwarding nominations to the Office of Education immediately. |
| March 5, 1959: | Institutions' nominations for individual award of fellowships due at the U.S. Office of Education. |

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| March 10, 1959: | Notice of fellowship awards sent to institutions. |
| April 15, 1959: | Deadline for acceptance of fellowships. |

In a news release dated January 16, 1959, Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick announced the 12 members of the National Advisory Committee which had been established to assist the Office of Education in administering the graduate fellowship program.¹⁰

On the date of the news release, the Committee held the initial meeting of a 2-day session to set up criteria for program approval and to commence evaluation of the 1,040 applications from 172 institutions requesting a total of 5,987 fellowships. Of the 1,040 applications, 371 were for "new" programs requesting 2,126 fellowships, and 669 were for "expanded" programs requesting 3,861 fellowships. A second 2-day session was held the following week to complete the evaluations and make recommendations for approval of programs and award of the 1,000 fellowships authorized for the first year of the program.

The staff of the Graduate Fellowship Section, along with one consultant, assisted in the evaluation of the applications.¹¹ In succeeding years the number of consultants grew to such an extent that the evaluation of applications was turned over almost entirely to the consultants, with the National Advisory Committee limiting itself principally to policy matters and questions pertaining to allocation of fellowships.

Eight criteria were employed in evaluating the applications:

1. The prospective ability of the applying institution, in terms of faculty, libraries, and equipment, competently to offer the program.
2. National need for instruction on college or university level in the proposed field.
3. Adequate ratio, at the applying institution, between the number of graduate faculty and the proposed number of graduate students.
4. The amount and extent of the applying institution's previous planning and development in the field proposed in the program.
5. Current or prospective national shortage of college or university teachers in the proposed field.
6. Regional shortage or deficiency in the offering of the proposed subject.
7. Likelihood that the applying institution will be able soundly to support the proposed program on a long-term basis.
8. The applying institution's past record, in the proposed

¹⁰ Names of the members of this Advisory Committee and of Committees in following years are listed in appendix D of this publication.

¹¹ The first consultant to be used for evaluation of programs was the author of this report who, at the time, was Chief for Natural Sciences and Mathematics in the Higher Education Programs Branch of the Division of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education.

field, of graduate doctors making a career of college teaching.

Approval Announced of 48 Programs, 160 Fellowships

It was mentioned in the first part of this chapter that \$800,000 of the \$40,000,000 first supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1959 had been allocated to the graduate fellowship program. Taking into account the first-year stipend of \$2,000 for fellows, with \$400 for each qualified dependent, along with up to \$2,500 institutional payment, the estimated average cost to the Government for each fellowship awarded was \$5,000. The \$800,000 of the first supplemental, therefore, guaranteed the award of only 160 of the 1,000 fellowships authorized to be awarded during fiscal year 1959.

The second supplemental request of \$75,300,000, including \$4,500,000 for the remaining 840 authorized fellowships, had gone from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Bureau of the Budget during mid-December of 1958, where it was not approved and transmitted to the Congress until the middle of February 1959.¹²

Therefore, when the target date of February 1 for announcement of program approval came around, it was possible to announce approval of only 48 programs to which 160 fellowships had been allocated—an average of three and one-third fellowships per program. In most cases, the number of fellowships allocated to a program was less than the number requested. This was done in order to allow the approval of a great number of programs.

Held in reserve from the January competition, awaiting passage of a second supplemental appropriation, were 232 new or expanded programs to which had been allocated the remaining authorized 840 fellowships.

Question Raised About a Program Approval in the Field of Religion

Not long after the February 1959 public announcement of program approvals allocating the initial 160 fellowships, HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming received complaints about the approval of a Ph. D. program, with an allocation of three fellowships, in Old Testament at Emory University, Atlanta, Ga. This was the first indication of a growing opposition to the support of the study of religion under a national defense education act. The opposition was later to culminate in restrictive legislation.

In response to Secretary Flemming's request for information on this matter, Dean Elder, on April 10, 1959, sent a letter to the Secretary explaining that the proposed new Ph. D. program at Emory University was very strong and had excellent ratings by the panelists. He said that the program was to be conducted on a purely objective and

most scholarly level and would certainly appeal to both Christians and Jews.

Hearings on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1960

The regular hearings on NDEA appropriation for fiscal year 1960 actually preceded approval of the second supplemental request for fiscal year 1959. This was due to the delay of the second supplemental in the Bureau of the Budget.

Presiding at the hearings, on February 26, 1959, Mr. Fogarty stated that he had hoped the second supplemental request would come to his subcommittee. "We are charged," he said, "with the responsibility for making the initial determination, at least, on how much you will have to operate in 1960, and to me they both go together. However, this is not the case. A new committee on supplementals and deficiencies has been set up."¹³

When Dr. Babbidge asserted that it was very important that the second supplemental be passed soon because graduate schools usually make their fellowship selections for the next year in March or April, Mr. Fogarty replied that he hoped Congress would not be blamed for the delay. The Bureau of the Budget, he said, had been responsible for holding it up for 6 or 7 weeks.¹⁴

Dr. Babbidge explained at the hearings that the \$13,450,000 requested for title IV would take care of 1,500 additional fellowships and 1,000 continued fellowships. He said that 1,000 of the 1,500 fellowships awarded for fiscal 1960 would presumably, though not necessarily, go to the institutions whose programs had been established or expanded in the previous year. It was not sufficient, he said, to encourage the new or expanded graduate program to admit one class of students and then drop it from further support. Presumably, a new graduate class would be admitted to that program.¹⁵

Mr. Fogarty asked Dr. Babbidge how many programs in total would be approved if the second supplemental request was appropriated and what the total impact of the title IV, competition would be. Dr. Babbidge replied that, of the approximate 1,000 program applications, about 125 would be supported by NDEA and an equal number would get under way without NDEA support, leaving about 750 programs which wouldn't get started at all.¹⁶

Mr. Fogarty also asked what would be the effect of the title IV program if the second supplemental request was denied. John F. Hughes, Executive Officer for the Office of Education, replied that 840 of the 1,000 fellowships authorized by NDEA for fiscal 1959 would be forever lost and consequently a lower appropriation for the fellowship program would be necessary for fiscal year 1960.¹⁷

¹² *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1960. Part I. Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. House. 86th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. p. 298.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 291.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 298.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 310.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 301.

Hearings on Fiscal Year 1959 Second Supplemental Appropriations

As mentioned earlier by Mr. Fogarty, the House Committee on Appropriations had created a Special Subcommittee on Deficiencies. Mr. Thomas of Texas was chairman of this subcommittee.

Commissioner Derthick testified on March 2, 1959, in regard to the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for an additional appropriation for fiscal year 1959 of \$75,300,000 for Defense Educational Activities and \$841,000 for salaries and expenses related thereto in administering these activities. He explained what had been accomplished in the title IV program up to that time and said there was a most urgent need for the additional requested funds of \$4.5 million to complete the awards of the remaining 840 authorized fellowships by the middle of March. At institutions throughout the country, he said, fellowship awards were generally offered by the first of April and, unless the National Defense Fellowships were made available on a timely basis in relation to these schedules, the caliber of NDEA programs would suffer and some fellowships might even go unawarded.¹⁸

Representative Frank T. Bow, Republican of Ohio, asked Dr. Derthick what assurance there was that the persons who got the fellowship grants would go into the teaching profession and not into industry. Dr. Derthick's reply was that there was no absolute guarantee, but he pointed out that graduate schools, in selecting persons for the fellowships, would give preference to those interested in college teaching. "The whole purpose of the program," he said, "is to increase the reservoir of personnel that goes into that field."¹⁹

The Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill, 1959, (H.R. 5916) was reported out of the House Appropriations Committee on March 20 and passed the House on March 24. Because of Senate hearings and amendments, a final bill did not pass both House and Senate until May 14 and was not signed into law (Public Law 86-30) until May 20, 1959. This law provided the full amount of \$75,300,000 which had been requested for Defense Educational Activities and included the \$4,500,000 which was necessary in order to fund the remaining 840 fellowships authorized for the first year of the program. The law also appropriated \$841,000 for additional salaries and expenses for the Office of Education, including salaries and expenses for expanded Defense Educational Activities.

Remaining Fiscal Year 1959 Fellowships Awarded

With the signing into law of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1959, Commissioner Derthick was

¹⁸ *Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill, 1959. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Appropriations. House, 86th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. p. 513.*

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 563.

able to approve 232 additional programs with 840 fellowships. Immediate notification went out to the awarded institutions, telling them of the number of fellowships which had been allocated to each program. Of course, the notification was sent much later than was desirable because, as stated earlier, institutions like to make their fellowship awards for the following year by the middle of April.

Public announcement of the newly approved programs was not made until an Office of Education news release was issued on June 5. This, of course, allowed little time to publicize the fellowship opportunities to students who would be eligible to apply for them; the fellowships all had to be awarded by June 30, 1959.

In a memorandum dated June 15 and airmailed to title IV coordinators at the participating institutions, Peter P. Muirhead, Director of the Financial Aid Branch,²⁰ explained that unless graduate schools acted quickly, they and therefore the Nation would irrevocably lose 3 years of supported graduate study for each fellowship unawarded by June 30. Institutions that could not fill by June 23 all of their allotted fellowships, or could use additional ones, were asked to notify the Graduate Fellowship Section by telephone. If it appeared that an institution would not be able to make use of all of its fellowships, it was planned to reallocate them to an institution which had indicated that it could use additional ones. Mr. Muirhead added that, because of the short notice given them, the institutions would not be criticized for falling short of filling their allotted fellowships within the time limitation.

Due to the fine cooperation of the participating institutions, all of the 1,000 authorized fellowships were awarded. Although the nonscience areas of humanities, education, and social sciences constituted only 49 percent of the program approvals, they received 56 percent of the fellowships.²¹ Of the 272 programs approved, 61 met the criterion of "new" and 211 met the criterion of "expanded."

Attributable-Cost Forms Sent to Institutions

Dean Elder returned to his post at Harvard University in the middle of April as he had planned. Dr. Babbidge took over the role of Acting Chief of the Graduate Fellowship Section until May 31. On May 22, he sent to all participating title IV institutions detailed forms and instructions for computing attributable-cost payments, asking that they be returned to the Office of Education no later than June 15, 1959. The instructions stated that if, during the developmental period of the program, time did not

²⁰ Mr. Muirhead had been Chief of the Student Loan Section and became Director of the Financial Aid Branch after Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., was appointed Director of the Division of Higher Education on June 1.

²¹ See chapter XV and appendix B for tables showing distribution of programs and fellowships by academic and subacademic areas for 1959-60 and succeeding years.

permit the computations necessary to determine the amount of indirect costs applicable to the fellowship program, institutions could, provisionally, *in lieu of detailed indirect costs*, claim a figure of 15 percent of direct cost items exclusive of the amounts for stipends and dependency allowances.

The filling out of the detailed attributable-cost forms was, of course, an onerous task for title IV program directors, as had been predicted at congressional hearings the previous year. As will be seen later, this lead to developing pressures to change to a flat institutional payment without cost accounting.

CHAPTER IV

second year of operation

Henry E. Bent, a chemist who was Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Missouri at Columbia, was chosen to be the second administrator of the Graduate Fellowship Program. He did not officially assume the duties of this office, however, until September 1959. Peter P. Muirhead acted as Chief, in addition to serving as Director of the Financial Aid Branch, until Dean Bent came to Washington.

Information and Forms

Payment Information to Fellows

In early August of 1959, a notice was sent to all title IV fellows informing them that they could expect to receive their first stipend and dependency allowance payment within approximately 2 weeks of the time that the Office of Education received official notification that they were enrolled in the graduate school. The amount and date of each payment were to be determined by the calendar of the institution's academic year and by a schedule, which

was enclosed, showing payment on a semester or quarter basis. Thus, if a fellow was enrolled in an institution on a regular two-semester academic year, one-half of the stipend and dependency allowance was to be paid upon enrollment in the fall semester and the other half at the beginning of the spring semester. The checks were to be mailed directly to the student from the U.S. Treasury. The notice also quoted a section from the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 that "an individual who is a candidate for a degree at an educational institution may exclude the amount of his National Defense Graduate Fellowship from gross income for tax purposes."

The fellows were also told that, contrary to what had been publicized previously, fellows were now eligible to apply for a loan under the Student Loan Program of title II, NDEA.

Policy and Procedure Manual

In the summer of 1959 the Graduate Fellowship Section prepared and sent to institutions a six-page leaflet titled

Information on National Defense Graduate Fellowships for the Academic Year 1960-61, designated as *Policy and Procedure Manual NDEA IV—No. 1*. As in the previous year, institutions were told that they could apply for approval of any number of programs, but that no more than 50 fellowships would be allocated to any one institution. Two or more institutions were permitted to jointly submit a program for approval, in which case the application had to be signed by both institutions and the credits earned at one of the institutions had to be fully transferable to the other.

Institutions were also informed in the *Policy and Procedure Manual* that they could request an additional allocation of fellowships to a program previously approved. Continued approval of a program did not necessarily mean that new fellowships would be awarded to students enrolling in the program in any given year. Such a decision was to be made each year. It was emphasized that, either in the application for approval of a program for the first time or in the request for additional fellowships, the institution should clearly indicate what steps it had taken, and planned to take, to assume increasing responsibility for continuance of the program and the increased enrollment in it.

The following schedule of deadline dates was contained in the *Policy and Procedure Manual*:

November 16, 1959	Institutional applications due at the U.S. Office of Education.
January 5, 1960	Public announcement of approved programs; institutions may begin forwarding nominations to the Office of Education immediately.
March 5, 1960	Institutions nominations for individual award of fellowships due at the U.S. Office of Education.
March 10, 1960	Notice of fellowship awards sent to institutions and a letter offering a fellowship sent to each selected nominee.
April 15, 1960	Deadline for acceptance of fellowships.

It is interesting to observe the advancement of dates compared to the previous year when the program was inaugurated under severe time handicaps.

Institutions Sent Application Forms and Instructions

In mid-August of 1959 supplies of forms and instructions to be used in applying for approval of National Defense Graduate Fellowship Programs for 1960-61 were mailed to title IV coordinators.

Institutions were instructed to list all the programs that they were submitting for approval—including requests for additional fellowships in programs already approved—in order of their priority. This ranking was to reflect the quality of the programs, the importance of the programs to

the sound development of the institution, the value of the programs in terms of the national educational picture, and such other factors as the institutions felt would be helpful to the Title IV Advisory Committee. The institutions were told that the ranking would guide the Advisory Committee in its evaluation of programs but the Committee would not be bound by it. Any significant deviation from the institution's own ranking of its programs would be made, however, only after careful consideration of all factors and would be explained upon request.

In the case of the program's being proposed for first-time approval, a program description was requested consisting of a statement not exceeding 10 pages, and in the case of a program requesting additional fellowships in an approved program, a statement not exceeding five pages.

Dean Bent Requests Institutions to Waive Tuition and Fees

On October 1, 1959, Dean Bent sent a letter to all title IV coordinators stating that he had reported for duty as Chief of the Graduate Fellowship Section and reminding them of the November 16 deadline for submission of institutional applications. In this letter he strongly urged institutions to waive tuition and fees for fellowship holders:

"As you doubtless remember, the position of this Office is that tuition and fees may be collected from Title IV Fellows, but if this procedure is followed, an equal amount must be deducted from the cost attributed to the program.

"As a consequence of the above bookkeeping procedures, in some cases there is little that an institution will gain from collecting tuition and fees but a great deal that may be lost by the student. In view of the fact that the fellowships are established as a stipend which is considered necessary in order to attract well-qualified students, it would seem undesirable to jeopardize the program by attempting to collect tuition and fees. Collection of tuition and fees simply transfers part of the cost of the program to the shoulders of the student from either the Government or the University. If the cost of the program is \$2,500 or less, then the transfer is from the Government to the student. On the other hand, if the cost of the program is considerably more than \$2,500, the burden is shifted from the institution to the student.

"From the above considerations I think most of us would agree that the best procedure would be for the institutions to waive tuition and fees for fellowship holders."

Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of October 3, 1959

Ineligibility of Advanced Students Discussed

Both HEW Secretary Arthur S. Flemming and Commissioner Lawrence G. Derthick attended the meeting of the Title IV Advisory Committee on October 3, 1959. Secretary Flemming was concerned about the eligibility rule limiting fellowships to students with no more than a half year of prior graduate study. He had become aware of the issue

through a letter from a Member of Congress. The Secretary said he felt that the half-year rule had the effect of discriminating against wholly worthy groups of students who had started graduate school before NDEA was passed. No Federal program should adopt policies that are discriminatory in their application, he said, and, for that reason, title IV ought to be thrown open to all qualified graduate students.

Dean J. P. Elder, a new member of the Committee stressed two points: first, that title IV wanted to recruit new people into teaching, not support those already committed; and, second, that awards of less than 3 years tenure would result in a loss of supported graduate study from the total title IV potential. Commissioner Derthick proposed that a technical amendment to title IV be offered to permit the reaward of unused time, something not possible under the then existing law. The Secretary said that he would be perfectly willing to support such an amendment, but reiterated that the Federal Government had no right to be arbitrary, and that, if the Congress had wanted any kind of limitation, it would have written it into the act. As a result of the discussion, a consensus seemed to develop that a quota of about 10 percent of the awards for advanced students would be proper.

Committee Asks for More Consultants

There was a general agreement that in the evaluation of programs during the coming competition additional experts in the various major areas should augment the Committee. It was generally felt that the individuals added should be educators broadly experienced in graduate work, not research-oriented persons from narrow areas. The Committee did not favor restricting its function to matters of policy. It wished to continue, as it had in the previous year, to assume responsibility for actual evaluation of programs.

Fellowship Distribution Proposal Raises Controversy

One Committee member expressed the viewpoint, shared by some others, that since the majority of doctoral candidates would be coming from the larger, well-established schools, the emphasis of title IV support from that point on should be in their direction. This point of view was vigorously objected to by some of the other members who felt that the emphasis on "new" programs and wide geographical distribution should be continued. It is significant, however, that the issue was raised at this meeting so early in the history of NDEA because pressures began to mount from that time on to broaden the concept under which title IV fellowships were awarded.

Committee Approves Three Motions

The Committee formally approved three motions:

1. That the calculation of attributable cost be eliminated in favor of a flat sum of \$2,500 per fellow or, if need be, a lesser sum down to \$2,000).
2. That maximum freedom be retained by each univer-

sity in its fiscal relationship with its title IV students (e.g., in regard to tuition).

3. That in the calculation of attributable costs, a university be allowed to charge the total cost of a program, even if students who were not title IV fellows should be studying in the program.

Dean Bent's Report to Association of Graduate Schools

At the 11th Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) held in New York City October 27-28, 1959, Dean Bent gave a status report on title IV of NDEA and reviewed some of the regulations and policy decisions that had been made effective since he had become Chief:¹

1. Fellowship awards had to be made before the end of June. If the fellowship holder resigned any time later for any reason—for example, for grade failure—the fellowship was lost for the 3-year period and so was the subsidy to the institution, except that in case the institution could show that it could not reduce its commitments incurred as a result of its participation in the title IV program, the Office of Education fiscal office would stand by its commitment and pay \$2,500 (if this was the allowable amount) to the institution for the full year.

2. Although a resigned fellowship could not be filled by someone else, a fellow who had to forego it because of illness or military service could pick it up at a later date. The fellow could start in the second semester, 2 years later, or even three years later.

3. Fellows would be permitted to work during the summertime, providing the program was a two-semester or three-quarter program, but if the school set up a program that covered the entire 11 months, the fellow could not be employed during the summer. The fellow could receive "G.I." benefits, if not on a fellowship during the summer.

4. In the first year of the program, a student, in order to be eligible, had to have no more than one-half year of graduate study in any field. For fellowships beginning in the fall of 1960, students would be eligible for fellowships if they had not more than a half year of graduate work which could be credited toward the program in which they were registered. This meant that a person who was shifting fields—he might have had a year or maybe 2 years of graduate work, or a year of professional graduate work—would be eligible for a title IV fellowship if not more than one semester was counted toward the new program.

5. All of the 1,000 fellowships in the first year of the program were awarded as 3-year fellowships. In line with the Title IV Advisory Committee recommendation of October 3, 1959, up to 150 fellowships, or 10 percent of the 1,500 which were to commence in the fall of 1960, could be awarded as second-year or third-year fellowships. This meant that a person could receive a 2-year fellowship (the second and third years of a fellowship) if he had had 1

¹ Henry E. Bent. "National Defense Education Act (Title IV)." With Discussion. In *Association of Graduate Schools Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*. 11th Annual Conference, 1959. pp. 83-94.

year of graduate study in the field of the fellowship or he could receive a 1-year fellowship (the third year of a fellowship) if he had had 2 years of graduate study in that field. Dean Bent pointed out the consequences, however, of appointing second-year or third-year fellows:

"This does not mean that any institution is even expected to make such nominations. The cost of appointing a second-year man or a third-year man is very considerable because in doing so you lose the first or the first 2 years of the fellowship. Thus, if we nominate one hundred fifty fellows as third-year men we lose three hundred year fellowships and the amount of money which we lose is \$1,380,000, part of which would have gone to students and part to institutions. So, under the circumstances, it would be a very convincing case when you would want to appoint a man to a third-year fellowship."²

In connection with this new policy, Dean Bent said that when submitting nominations for fellowships to the Commissioner of Education, the institutions would be asked to list the first-year students separately and unranked and list together second- and third-year students, if any, indicating which they were and the order of preference. If second- or third-year students were nominated, at least an equal number of first-year students should be named as alternates, in order of preference. This procedure was necessary to assure that institutional preferences would be respected if the number of nominations of second- and third-year students exceeded 150.

Recommendations for Changes in Regulations

In addition to the changes in policies and regulations listed previously, Dean Bent reported that he was working hard to effect three additional changes:

1. When a student failed for any reason to show up at an institution, or, on account of failing grades, did not continue, he wanted it to be possible for some eligible candidate to take the place of that student.

2. He wanted to do away with the current accounting procedures, and establish a flat amount of \$2,500 for each institution. He was, however, not very optimistic about gaining approval of this recommendation:

"There are certain reasons why I am not hopeful about its being approved, one reason being that too many institutions found that they could expand their programs for \$1,000 or \$1,500 per student and so, obviously, when Congress or the Bureau of the Budget looks at this, they say, 'How can we justify a flat figure of \$2,500 if it means that we are paying some institution \$1,000 or more than it costs?' Since this adds up to \$100,000 and there are plenty of people looking for \$100,000, it is pretty hard to justify a flat figure. Even if you cut down from \$2,500 to \$2,000, you still have quite a sizable number of institutions which have found they can expand their programs for considerably less than the amount. It makes no difference that half of the institutions discovered that it would cost them a

lot more than \$2,500. This doesn't show on the books because we automatically cut everybody off at \$2,500 so the average is necessarily less than that. It is one of our handicaps in trying to get a flat figure. I still hope that we can do it and I suspect you would vote unanimously for a flat figure."³

3. If an institution started an NDEA program with a certain number of students and had made commitments with regard to costs, and then a year or 2 later more students came into the program, Dr. Bent didn't want the institution penalized for being so successful. The accountants were ruling that if only half or perhaps a third of the students were title IV fellows, then an institution could charge only half or a third of the cost of the program. He wanted to see the ruling changed so that nontitle IV students would not be included in the attributable-cost-per-fellow determination.

Other Comments

Dean Bent said he believed that in the future more emphasis would be placed upon "expanded" and less upon "new" programs. He also indicated that after a while he would be sending out a short questionnaire to help evaluate the success of the title IV program. Finally, he stated that programs already being supported by NDEA fellowships would be permitted to apply for additional ones in succeeding years, but he hoped that the institutions would indicate in their applications what steps were being taken to make the programs eventually self-supporting.

Evaluation of 1960-61 Program Applications

By the time of the cutoff date of November 16, 918 program applications requesting a total of 5,370 fellowships had been received. The Title IV Advisory Committee, assisted by five eminent consultants from outside the Office of Education, spent 3 weekends in late November and the first part of December evaluating and rating the applications. At the first meeting, on November 27, at which criteria and guidelines were discussed before evaluation began, Dean Bent reported a recommendation of the Panel on Basic Research and Graduate Education, the President's Science Advisory Committee. The panel, which was chaired by Glenn T. Seaborg, Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley, recommended that, in view of the large support given to the natural sciences by Federal entities other than the Office of Education, the latter should increase next year the amount of support given to the humanities and social sciences.

Each program submitted was read by at least two persons from the 12-member Title IV Advisory Committee and the five consultants and by at least one staff member of the Graduate Fellowship Section. After the initial ratings had been completed during the first 2 weekend meetings, the Graduate Fellowship Section reviewed all the evaluations to assure that various pertinent factors, such as geographi-

² Ibid., pp. 86-87.

³ Ibid., pp. 88-89.

cal distribution and unused graduate capacity, were fully taken into account. The Committee was aided in its review by preliminary data from a study by staff member John L. Chase. Dr. Chase, in the fall of 1959, had conducted a survey of doctoral study in the United States. With the use of his data, the Committee was alerted against approving programs in institutions which were located near other institutions having similar programs and unused capacity.⁴

The recommendations of the staff were presented to the Advisory Committee at its meeting on December 12. The Committee voted to allow no institution to receive more than 30 fellowships rather than 50 as had been publicized. This required some reassignment of fellowships.

As a result of the decisions made at this meeting, 474 of the 918 applications from 155 institutions received Commissioner of Education approval. Of the 474, 202 were programs approved for the first time; 202 were programs which were approved in 1959-60 but now received additional fellowships; and 70 were programs which received continued approval without additional fellowships. The number of institutions with one or more approved programs increased from 123 in 1959-60 to 139 in 1960-61.

As was true for programs and fellowships in 1959-60, the nonscience areas—the humanities, education, and social sciences—received a higher percentage (62 percent) of the fellowships than they did of the program approval (54 percent). In line with the Seaborg panel recommendations, the percentage of fellowships allotted to the humanities and social sciences increased from 51 percent in 1959-60 to 55 percent for 1960-61. Of the 404 programs approved for new fellowships, 90 were “new” and 314 were “expanded.”

For the first time, jointly sponsored programs were approved. There were two. One was a program involving six fellows who would study the classics. Pooling resources were the State University of Iowa (now called the University of Iowa), the University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin. Under the arrangement, students would spend a year at each institution and would benefit from a range of faculty, courses, and library resources that no one of the three schools could offer by itself. The other joint venture was a program in physics to be offered at Linfield College in Oregon, which granted the M.A. degree, and Oregon State University, which offered the Ph. D. Fellows would spend their first year at Linfield, earn the master's degree, and then move on to Oregon State to complete the doctorate.

Policy Recommendations

After the Advisory Committee completed the work on evaluations and recommendations at its December 12 meeting, it took up a number of policy matters. One concerned teaching by title IV fellows. The Committee voted to encourage institutions to require teaching of students holding

title IV fellowships up to the maximum of one-quarter time for two semesters or half-time for one semester, with the understanding that services would be paid for at the going rate for graduate assistants. The Committee also recommended sending announcements as early in the spring of 1961 as possible for program applications for 1961-62 in order to allow more time for their preparation.

The Committee considered two possible amendments to the title IV program proposed by the Graduate Fellowship staff. On the matter of expansion of the graduate fellowship program, the Committee favored an increase in the number of new fellowships from 1,500 to 2,000 annually, with 1,000 of them to be awarded without the requirements of newness or expansion in the program, accompanied by a flat institutional payment of \$1,500 per such fellowship. The Committee also voted to recommend 1,000 fellowships for the terminal year of the doctor's degree, each to carry an institutional payment of \$1,500. Such fellowships were to be authorized annually over a period of 3 years with the understanding that the program would be a terminal one.

The public announcement of the approved programs and the fellowship allocations to them was made early in January, as scheduled. Along with the announcement, Dean Bent sent to all institutions which had submitted applications a letter explaining that, since more than 900 proposals were received—with the possibility of approving fewer than half that number—many very excellent programs could not be supported. Also, failure to support a program which began in September 1959 was not to be misunderstood to mean dissatisfaction or lack of confidence in the action taken the previous year. He said that in some instances it seemed more appropriate to give financial support and more fellowships in the third and fourth year of the program rather than during the current year. Since limitations had precluded the approval of many excellent proposals in that competition, he recommended that there be no hesitation in resubmitting some or all of them the following year.

Dean Bent also notified the institutions of the December 12 Advisory Committee Meeting recommendation that part-time teaching by title IV fellows be encouraged. He said some department might even wish to make such teaching a requirement of title IV fellowship holders, in which case, of course, students should be so notified before being nominated for a fellowship. Dean Bent passed on to the institutions the Advisory Committee recommendation that a fellow be paid for his teaching at the regular rate paid to other graduate students for similar work.

Inception of the Fellow's Handbook

In January of 1960 the Graduate Fellowship Section prepared and sent out a five-page, stapled leaflet titled *Information on National Defense Graduate Fellowships for Fellowship Holders*. In later years, as the program expanded, this publication grew in size and coverage and came to be known as the *NDEA Title IV Fellow's Handbook*.

All the rules pertaining to fellows that had thus far been adopted were included in the leaflet. In addition, fellows

⁴ The complete findings of the study were published in 1961: John L. Chase, *Doctoral Study* (OE-54016). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 65.

were told of the ruling that they could not use a fellowship at any institution except the one at which it was granted; nor could they use it in other programs at the original institution.

Hearings on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1961

Secretary Flemming was the opening witness on February 1, 1960, at the House of Representatives hearings on fiscal year 1961 appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Commissioner Derthick also testified on February 3 before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, chaired as usual by Mr. Fogarty of Rhode Island. The request approved by the Bureau of the Budget for Defense Educational Activities was \$171,000,000, of which a sum of \$20,750,000 was requested for fiscal year 1961 to continue a third year the 1,000 fellowships awarded in fiscal year 1959, to continue a second year the 1,500 fellowships awarded in fiscal year 1960, and to pay the cost of 1,500 additional fellows authorized for fiscal year 1961.

Representative Fred Marshall, Democrat of Minnesota, asked Secretary Flemming if he thought that some of the title IV programs which had been approved, such as philosophy, behavioral science, psychology, folklore, theater, music, etc., were in line with the needs of national defense. Mr. Marshall referred to the preamble of NDEA which stated that the purpose of the act was to insure trained manpower of sufficient quantity and quality to meet the national defense needs of the country.

Secretary Flemming replied that he felt these programs represented legitimate areas of study under the act:

"I might say that I personally am glad that the Congress in passing the National Defense Act did not narrow that particular title because we are confronted with some very serious potential shortages in teaching in the field of higher education in all subject matter areas. I think that the shortages that confront us in the field of the humanities are potentially just as serious as the shortages that may confront us in the field of science or mathematics because I think in terms of the future of the country that it is important for us to be in a position to provide the students who attend our colleges with a well rounded education under the leadership of outstanding teachers in all subject matter areas."⁵

When Dr. Derthick testified, Mr. Fogarty questioned a paragraph under "Evidence of Need" that appeared in the statement of justification submitted to his subcommittee:

"Earlier estimates had assumed that the average annual need of new teachers in higher education would vary between 18,000 and 22,000 through 1970. More recent studies,

however, indicate that the need will be more than twice as great—in the neighborhood of 48,000 annually."⁶

Mr. Fogarty asked where the figures came from and how there could be such a great discrepancy in estimates. Dr. Derthick replied that estimates previously made were not made on as sound a basis as at the present time. Mr. Fogarty then observed:

"It seems to me that we're not going to meet the need, because the authorization (1,500 new fellowships) is too small."

Dr. Derthick agreed, stating it was obvious that title IV was certainly one of the titles of NDEA that should be continued and expanded when the time came about for amending NDEA.

The appropriations bill (H.R. 11390), when finally passed and approved on September 2, 1960, as Public Law 86-703, contained an appropriation of \$173,050,000 for Defense Educational Activities, including the \$20,750,000 necessary to fund fully the NDEA Graduate Fellowship Program for 1960-61.

Commissioner's Response to Criticism of Certain Approved Title IV Programs

Following the announcement of the approved graduate fellowship programs for the 1960-61 academic year under title IV of NDEA, an article appeared in a weekly newsletter, *Human Events*, which criticized the selection of several of the approved programs. Among the approved programs singled out for criticism were ceramics, folklore, counseling and guidance, adult education, home economics, and dramatic arts. A number of newspapers throughout the country had quoted the article on their editorial pages, and as a consequence the Office of Education received several inquiries as to whether or not the facts set forth in *Human Events* were true. For this reason, Commissioner Derthick issued on March 17, 1960, a four-page statement explaining in some detail the reasons these programs were approved.

First the statement referred to the purpose of the graduate fellowship program as spelled out in the act itself: namely, to encourage students to prepare for college teaching, to expand graduate facilities so that more students could be trained for college teaching, and to promote a wider geographical distribution of graduate facilities. It was the congressional intent, the statement said, to provide graduate fellowships in all subject fields where an expansion of facilities was needed and justified. The leadership role of the United States in world affairs depended upon the quality of the entire system of higher education, and colleges and universities would not be able to make the contribution to the Nation's strength and security if they were asked to concentrate their efforts on training teachers in only a few areas. Then the statement proceeded to give justification for approval of the criticized programs. In the case of ceramics, the criticism was due to a misunderstanding. The program did not concern pottery, as some

⁵ *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1961. Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. House. 86th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. p. 160.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 356.

critics thought, but rather the highly advanced field of study of inorganic polymers.

Meeting of the Advisory Committee on May 13 and 14, 1960

At the Advisory Committee meeting of May 13-14, 11 members of the 12-member Title IV Advisory Committee and eight invited guests (six of them graduate deans) from outside the Office of Education were in attendance, along with Director Muirhead of the Financial Aid Branch, Chief Bent of the Graduate Fellowship Section, and several professional staff members.

New or Expanded Programs Versus Existing Programs

One of the issues which was the subject of lively discussion was that of the emphasis being given to new or expanded programs when there was much unused capacity in already existing strong programs at other institutions. One of the participants at the meeting argued that the application of the standards of newness and expansion was arbitrary and led to an emphasis on novelty, which was undesirable. He maintained that the purpose of title IV was to increase the Nation's potential to develop college teachers and that college teachers were needed not in novel programs but in the core areas of education. Several participants supported the view that it would be preferable to strengthen existing programs rather than expand them further when they were underused. Dean Bent pointed out, however, that even if all of the unused capacity in the graduate schools were fully utilized, there would still be a short supply of teachers. This fact, he said, argued for the development of graduate programs beyond those currently in operation. Several deans supported him in this point of view.

Tuition for Title IV Fellows

Another topic on which there was a divergence of views was the question of whether or not an institution should be permitted to charge tuition and fees, considering the fact that the institution received a cost-of-education payment of up to \$2,500 per student. Several maintained that, by charging the student tuition and fees, an institution was depreciating the value of a fellowship to the student and undermining one of the purposes of the program. The opposing view was that graduate education was very expensive and some institutions had to utilize every avenue of income it could in order to make ends meet. The discussion led to the adoption of the following statement which was to be distributed to institutions in the application materials for 1961-62:

"Institutions are expected to make suitable arrangements to assure a net stipend to the holder of a Title IV Fellowship which is adequate to enable him to pursue a full time course of study without outside employment. For example: If an institution charges tuition it might award an additional scholarship to the Fellow or pay his tuition

from the institutional payment which accompanies the fellowship. Another alternative is to waive tuition in whole or in part. Some institutions will find it important to note that the amount of tuition collected from a student is deducted from the attributable cost in arriving at the payment to be made by the Office of Education to the institution.

"The institution is expected to advise an NDEA Fellowship candidate, at the time he is nominated, of the terms of the award, including tuition charges."

Recommendations

The Committee next asked to go on record with a statement urging a multiplication of the number of fellowships to be awarded in view of the great need for college teachers. The Committee unanimously agreed to the following resolution:

"The Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commissioner of Education on the Title IV Program of the National Defense Act, expresses its confidence, both to the Commissioner and to the academic community, that the Title IV Program has made a significant contribution to alleviating the shortage of college teachers. It further recognizes, however, that the magnitude of the problem requires the continuation and expansion of a Graduate Fellowship Program under the sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education and urges that all appropriate actions be taken to effect that goal."

The Committee also made the following two recommendations:

1. The Committee recommended that the 1960-61 limit of 150 fellowships to be awarded to second- and third-year students was a reasonable one and should be continued for another year.

2. The Committee recommended that the administrators of the title IV program undertake a placement listing of title IV fellows in their last year of graduate study. Such a list would be circulated, perhaps several times during the year, to all 4-year institutions of higher education in order to bring title IV fellows to the attention of college administrators. It was understood that the Office of Education would have no responsibility for employment other than publicizing the availability of this group of potential teachers. It was also agreed that cooperation and coordination with the Woodrow Wilson program would be desirable.

In regard to the calendar for the next fiscal year, the Committee was asked if it would be willing to devote an entire week to the evaluation of programs rather than 3 weekends, as in the past. The Committee agreed that meeting for 1 full week would save time and improve the quality of evaluations. The Committee also agreed that the early March nomination date should be continued and that steps be taken to encourage students to make known as soon as possible their decision to accept or decline the fellowship offer.

The Chase Study

John L. Chase, who had left the Graduate Fellowship Section in March 1960 to become Specialist for the Social Sciences in the Higher Education Programs Branch of the Office of Education, was called upon to give some of the findings of a survey of doctoral study which he had initiated early in the fall of 1959. He reported that 139 graduate schools had indicated that they could accept 20,405 additional doctoral candidates in their graduate schools with the faculty and facilities that they would have available at the beginning of the academic year 1960-61, without lowering the quality of their graduate training. Forty-eight percent of the additional doctoral capacity was in the natural sciences, mathematics, and engineering; of the remainder, 37 percent was split rather evenly between the social sciences and the humanities.

Dr. Chase also stated that institutions had reported 3,930 graduate students as having completed all formal requirements for the doctor's degree except the dissertation and whom they were willing to recommend for a 1-year fellowship to enable them to finish the dissertation. The greatest percentage of these, the so-called ABD's (all but the dissertation) was in the social sciences and humanities, 59 percent; the physical sciences and engineering together represented 27 percent of the total. The smallest percentage of the ABD's was in the biological sciences.

The survey also revealed that the most serious barrier to the further expansion of graduate education over the following 3 to 5 years was the lack of financial support for graduate students. The second highest ranking barrier was lack of academic facilities.

The findings of Dr. Chase's study were timely because thought was beginning to be given to possible amendments to NDEA; the act was due to expire on June 30, 1962. Some of the recommendations that were to be made later in the nature of expanding the scope of the title IV appear to have stemmed from these findings.

Dean Bent's Letter of Late May 1960 to Title IV Coordinators

In a letter to coordinators in late May, Dean Bent announced that application forms and instructions to be used in connection with new NDEA title IV fellowship programs for the year 1961-62, as well as for additional fellowships for programs already approved, would be mailed out before the end of June with a deadline of October 31 for the return of the completed applications.

Dean Bent's letter quoted the resolution passed at the May 13-14 meeting of the Title IV Advisory Committee in regard to tuition charges for title IV fellows. The letter also announced a new policy whereby, under certain conditions, it would be possible to grant educational leave to title IV fellows.

Dean Bent cited two kinds of cases which would undoubtedly arise rather frequently. First, the case in which

the normal progress toward a degree included a period of time, usually spent off campus and with no course credit given, for practical work. Clinical experience in certain areas of psychology, and teaching experience in education, were examples of these. The second was the case in which the writing of a dissertation would require field work for gathering data before the dissertation could actually be written.

Permission for "educational leave" would be based on conscious planning, supervised by the student's adviser and dean, and the leave had to make an important contribution to the student's graduate program. The Office of Education wanted to know, at the time a student began his NDEA fellowship, just what this pattern would be. The period of the award, including the leave of absence, had to be set in advance and approved by the Commissioner. The purpose of providing for educational leave was to allow sufficient flexibility to allow each student to follow the course of study which he and his institution decided was the best one possible.

Dean Bent also urged title IV coordinators to take some care in the titles they gave to programs they would submit for approval in the fall. In general, they were asked to indicate first the major department in which the program was to be offered, then follow this with a subhead showing a special field, if one was involved. This assistance was necessary to avoid confusion in the listing of approved programs and would insure that students in chemistry, for example, would find a program in radiation chemistry listed under chemistry, rather than radiation.

At the end of his letter Dean Bent announced that he was returning to the University of Missouri on June 1 and that Robert H. Bruce, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Wyoming, would become his successor. Until Dean Bruce arrived in September, Robert M. Rosenzweig was to be Acting Chief of the Section.

Other 1959-60 Activities

Two questionnaires were sent out by the Graduate Fellowship Section during the last half of the fiscal year. The first one was to title IV fellows asking such questions as whether or not they would have attended graduate school if they had not received a title IV fellowship, whether or not their fellowship had influenced a decision to work toward a master's or doctor's degree, how many years they estimated it would take them to earn the doctorate with, and without, a title IV fellowship, and whether or not their fellowship had influenced them toward deciding on a career of college teaching. The second questionnaire was sent to the directors of the title IV programs. It was open-ended and requested narrative answers to 11 questions on the impact of the title IV program on title IV fellows, availability of teaching assistants, teaching loads of faculty, expansion of facilities, and related matters. No publication resulted from either of these questionnaires. The findings were used simply as a tool for internal evaluation of the

title IV program and for preparing justifications to be used in congressional hearings.

1960-61 Fellowship Awards Announced

In the May 1960 issue of the Office of Education publication *Higher Education*, it was announced that the 1,500

new fellowships for 1960-61 had been officially awarded. Of these, 1,420 were full 3-year fellowships, while 72 fellowships went to second-year graduate students and eight to third-year students. It is interesting to observe that, although institutions were permitted to award as many as 150 fellowships to second-year and third-year graduate students, they nominated only 80 for such awards.

CHAPTER V

third year of operation

Robert H. Bruce, a psychologist, did not officially become Chief of the Graduate Fellowship Section until September 1, 1960. He served, however, 1 week in June and 1 week in July as a consultant to the Section. In July he sent a letter to the Title IV Advisory Committee telling about plans for the ensuing year. He also informed the Committee that a final appeal had been rejected by the Comptroller General in the matter of replacing fellows whose appointments had been terminated before expiration. He said that apparently appropriate legislative action would be required before replacements could be made.

Regulations on Administration of Title IV Published in *Federal Register*

The first official regulations pertaining to the administration of the National Defense Fellowship Program appeared in the *Federal Register* September 29, 1960. These regulations gave legal status to the policies and procedures that had been developed during the 2 years of the title IV

program. In addition, the *Register* included a few new policy determinations.

One of the new regulations concerned outside work by a fellow. The previous rule was inflexible, namely, that a fellow could not engage in gainful employment (periods of time falling between academic years excluded) during the period of his fellowship, except that if he was holding a 3- or 2-year fellowship he could be employed by the institution in which he was enrolled, in teaching or research determined to be beneficial to his academic program, up to one-fourth time during no more than one of such academic years. The *Register* announced a relaxation in the rule. Henceforth, the Commissioner could approve longer employment periods upon written application submitted by the fellow and approved by his adviser and the dean of the graduate school. The approved application was to set forth the need of the fellow for such employment and its relation to his academic program.

Another new policy concerned the period of the fellowship award. Normally the fellowship was for a period

not to exceed 3 consecutive years beginning with the academic year indicated in the award. Under the new rule, on the application of the fellowship holder, forwarded to the Commissioner of Education with the recommendation of the institution, the Commissioner could waive the requirement that the years be consecutive. The waiver would be made for good cause, such as illness or induction into the Armed Services, or other circumstances deemed by the Commissioner to be consistent with the objectives of the program.

Also included in the regulations were rules concerning payments for dependents. A dependent was defined as an individual who received one-half or more of his or her support from the fellow and either (1) was a spouse, child (including stepchild), or parent (including stepparent or parent-in-law of the fellow or (2) was one for whose support the fellow was legally responsible. As provided in the act itself, a fellow was entitled to receive \$400 each fellowship year for each dependent, to be issued in installments along with stipend payments. In case of the acquisition of a new dependent during fellowship tenure, a fellow was entitled to the amount payable for an entire installment period if the dependency began during the first half of the installment period. If the dependency began in the second half of an installment period, a fellow was entitled to half of the amount payable for the entire installment period.

New Manual Issued for Participating Graduate Schools

In the fall of 1959, a six-page, stapled leaflet designated as *Policy and Procedure Manual NDEA Title IV—No. 1* was issued by the Office of Education and sent to all title IV coordinators. In October 1960, a 46-page booklet titled *The National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program: A Manual for Participating Graduate Schools* (October 1960, OE-55016), was issued to replace the leaflet of the previous year. The purpose of the new manual was described in its Introduction:

"This Manual of policies and procedures for the National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program is written for the use of officials at participating graduate schools whose duties touch on the operation of the Fellowship Program. It brings together in one place the law, the regulations, and policies adopted pursuant to them that govern the conduct of Title IV. Inevitably, as new situations arise, or as experience dictates its wisdom, some of the policies contained in this Manual will change. When a change takes place, appropriate notice will be given and the new statement should be substituted in the Manual for the old."

The 1960 *Manual* covered in detail: the purpose of the program; institutional eligibility and participation; description, terms, and conditions of fellowship awards; responsibilities of participating institutions; and, rules governing attributable costs. It also contained nine appendixes which included forms and specific instructions used in the administration of the program.

In addition to rules and policies previously discussed in this report, the new manual announced that, although an institution could apply for approval of any number of programs, each year a limit (which was not specified) would be set on the total number of fellowships which would be allotted to any institution. In previous announcements, 50 was stated as the limit. The manual also announced that the Office of Education would not intercede on the behalf of any student in Selective Service matters. It added, however, that the Office would undertake on request, to inform any draft board of the nature and purposes of the title IV program.

Question on Distribution of Fellowships

On October 15, 1960, 1 month in advance of the meeting of Advisory Committee members and consultants to evaluate title IV applications for the academic year 1961-62, Dean Bruce sent to Committee members a staff-prepared analysis of various factors which he thought they might want to take into account when considering the distribution of fellowships. The analysis included data on existing distribution of full-time faculty by major areas; percent of recent doctorate holders entering college and university service; number of fellowship awards by the Federal Government and all of the large private agencies; and the amount of support for graduate study by fellowships from all sources. One of the significant conclusions drawn by Dean Bruce from this analysis was that the fields of the humanities and education were receiving very little fellowship support. Another was that students in the biological sciences were receiving nearly twice as much support as students in the physical sciences and the social sciences, due most likely to the large amounts of money being contributed by the National Institutes of Health.

Dean Bruce reported that, as a result of agreement with NDEA title VI (Language Development) administrators, title IV would offer no fellowships in languages other than French, German, Spanish, and Italian. Also, clinical psychology and related disciplines would not be supported by title IV fellowships because these were well supported by the National Institute of Mental Health.

Assistant Commissioner Babbidge Reports on Title IV to Association of Graduate Schools

At the annual meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) held in San Francisco October 24-26, 1960, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., gave a status report on the title IV program.¹ Dean Bruce also attended this meeting, as a guest of the Association.

Dr. Babbidge lauded the cooperation of the many members of AGS who had assisted in the implementation of the

¹ Homer D. Babbidge, Jr. "Graduate Fellowships and the Federal Government." In *Association of Graduate Schools Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Twelfth Annual Conference*. Edited by Everett Walters. The Ohio State University Press. 1960. pp. 87-99.

title IV program. He discussed the conflicting points of view within the graduate community—between those who favored the “newness” and “expansion” requirements of the existing law and those who favored allocation of more fellowships to underutilized strong graduate schools. He said that he favored a middle ground between these two extreme points of view—namely, that a certain portion of the fellowships continue to be awarded under the requirements of the existing law, and that additional authority be given to the Office of Education to award the remaining fellowships without regard to newness, expansion, or broader geographical distribution. The presidential election was coming up shortly and Dr. Babbidge emphasized that he did not know what the next administration would recommend in this regard. He pointed out, however, that both presidential candidates had recommended continuation and expansion of the graduate program.

In his speech, Dr. Babbidge erred in two predictions. First, he said that he didn't believe that the Office could continue indefinitely the highly successful rotation of graduate deans to administer the title IV program. Second, he said that the Office had “weathered the small storm” that had sprung up as a result of fellowship awards in such fields as religious history, Biblical literature, folklore, ceramics, music, and ecology of flowing waters.

Administrative Problems Faced by the Graduate Fellowship Section

Because of the growth in the number of fellows on tenure (almost 2,500 in 1960–61), the small staff of the Graduate Fellowship Section was finding it increasingly difficult to handle the clerical work in a way that would insure timely payments to title IV fellows. The problem would be greater in 1961–62, with almost 4,000 fellows on tenure.

Therefore, in a letter on November 3 to title IV coordinators, Dean Bruce asked if each institution, in order to insure prompt payments to fellows, would be willing to assume the responsibility for transmitting U.S. Treasury checks to fellows. The Office of Education would send the checks to the institution before the opening of the school year. The institution would then distribute the checks to the fellows.

A second problem was that of moving up the deadline for submission of applications from October 31 to September 30 in order to allow more time for publicizing the opportunities available to prospective students under title IV. Without the help of institutions in disbursement of payments to fellows, the small Office of Education staff would be totally unable to cope with the processing of the large number of program applications coming in at the same time as the checks were to be distributed.

Title IV Competition for Academic Year 1961–62

The Advisory Committee, augmented by eight consultants comprised of college presidents, deans, and professors, convened on November 16, 1960, to review and rate 948 applications submitted by 161 graduate schools and request-

ing 5,094 new fellowships to commence in 1961–62. After the group and the Office staff had spent several days evaluating and reviewing the applications Dean Bruce and three Advisory Committee members made the final allocation of fellowships on November 28. On December 12 Commissioner Derthick announced the approval of 525 programs at 146 graduate schools. Of the 525 approved programs, 321 were previously approved programs which received additional fellowships for 1961–62, and 204 were programs approved for fellowships for the first time. There were also 155 programs continuing in 1961–62 without an additional allocation of fellowships.

Fifty-five percent of the 525 approved programs and 61 percent of the 1,500 fellowships allocated were in the humanities, education, and the social sciences. These were the largest percentages allocated to nonscience fields in the 3-year history of the program.

As had Dean Bent the previous year, Dean Bruce in January 1961 sent out a letter to all institutions which had submitted proposals for programs for 1961–62. The letter explained why, due to limitations imposed by the authorizing act and related appropriated funds, many excellent programs could not be supported. The letter also discussed the shortcomings of some of the proposals, suggesting that these deficiencies be corrected before the next submission.

Secretary's Panel of Consultants Makes Recommendations

The National Defense Educational Act of 1958 had 4-year authorization and was due to expire on June 30, 1962, unless extended. In order to allow adequate lead time, it would be necessary for the 87th Congress to consider amending the act during its first session. To gather expert advice on what kinds of amendments to NDEA would be desirable, Secretary Flemming appointed in late summer of 1960 a panel of 21 consultants. The panel included a heavy representation of public school administrators together with presidents and deans of colleges and universities, both private and State-supported. The field of graduate education was represented by R. M. Lumiansky, Dean of the Graduate School and Provost of Tulane University. The panel held five sessions in the fall of 1960, and its report was released at a new conference on January 12, 1961.²

The panel recommended that any extensions of NDEA voted by the Congress should be for a period of 5 years, and it made specific recommendations for each of the titles. For title IV the consultants recommended:

1. That the present program be continued and expanded.
2. That additional fellowships be authorized for those institutions that could use them within existing capacity of established departments.
3. That the Commissioner of Education be authorized

² *National Defense Education Act*. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senate, 87th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 559.

to appoint substitutes to fellowships vacated before the full term was used.

4 That a uniform payment to the institution of \$2,500 per fellow per year accompany each fellowship.

5. That additional fellowships be authorized for a period of 1 year for college and university teachers who needed to complete requirements for a doctoral degree.

6. That fellowships be provided for postdoctoral training.

7. That the graduate fellowship program be broadened and greatly expanded to include the granting of fellowships, of appropriate duration and character, to students planning to teach at the elementary and secondary school level.

In arriving at their recommendations, the consultants had utilized background material prepared by the Office of Education staff. In recommending a uniform payment of \$2,500 per fellow per year to accompany each fellowship, the consultants had been informed that incomplete data submitted by some of the institutions participating in the title IV program indicated that \$3,400 was a representative figure of the yearly cost to the institution for the education of one fellow, although Dean Bruce was of the opinion that the actual cost was well in excess of this figure.

Administration Recommends Amendments to NDEA

Senator John F. Kennedy, the 1960 Democratic nominee for President, was elected 35th President of the United States in November 1960. He had been for a number of years a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and therefore was much interested in the problems of education. As will be discussed in chapter 14, he was the prime mover in the 1959 and 1960 attempts to remove the controversial disclaimer affidavit from NDEA. In his campaign for the Presidency he promised, if elected, to support programs which would strengthen education throughout the country.

A month after his inauguration, President Kennedy sent a "Special Message to the Congress on Education."³ In this message he recommended a 3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teacher salaries; a long-term low-interest-rate loan program for academic facilities; scholarships for talented and needy young people; and modernization of the National Vocational Acts. He did not in this message make any recommendations pertaining to NDEA but said that he would "subsequently ask the Congress to amend and expand the Student Loan and other provisions of the National Defense Education Act."⁴

On April 25, 1961, President Kennedy submitted to Congress his recommendations on extending and improving

NDEA. He did this by means of identical letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, accompanied by a copy of the letter he had received from his new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham A. Ribicoff, describing the proposed legislation in some detail. In regard to title IV, the Ribicoff letters proposed:

"3. Graduate fellowship program (title IV): Make permanent and substantially enlarge and extend the program of graduate fellowships.

"We propose that the aggregate number of new fellowships to be awarded annually be increased from 1,500 to 5,000 with up to 2,500 to be awarded to persons accepted by institutions establishing new or expanded graduate programs as under the present title. The remainder would be awarded to persons selected by the Commissioner for study in any graduate programs at any institutions of higher education.

"We also recommend that the Commissioner of Education be authorized to appoint substitutes for fellowships vacated before the full term is used. This is not now possible under the act.

"We propose that the cost-of-education allowance to the institution attended by a fellowship holder be fixed at \$2,500 per fellow in new or expanded graduate programs, and at \$2,000 in other programs, in lieu of the varying amounts now authorized. Experience indicates that these amounts are well within the average costs involved, and that the administrative burdens to the institutions and the Federal Government of determining costs on a fellow-by-fellow basis are not warranted. Also, the provisions relating to the amounts of stipends for the fellows would be made more flexible so that they could readily be adjusted in the light of changes in the cost of living and other relevant factors, by making the amounts thereof subject to determination by the Commissioner.

"We would amend the act to give preference in the award of fellowships to those who intend to teach in elementary and secondary schools as well as to those who intend to teach in institutions of higher learning.

"The graduate fellowship program under title IV has, in our judgment gone a long way toward fulfilling the objectives of strengthening and expanding graduate education throughout the country. This title, with its emphasis on expansion of opportunities for doctoral candidates in institutions of higher education, and on the award of fellowships to persons who contemplate careers in teaching, is due to provide soon a much needed increment to the faculty needs of our colleges and universities. In view of the estimated need for 22,500 additional new faculty members each year, however, greatly increased efforts are necessary.

"The successful experience which the Office of Education has had with title IV, in cooperation with the graduate schools of the country, clearly indicates to us that this program, enlarged and placed on a permanent basis, can and will play a key role in assuring that requisite faculty will be available to train the greatly increased number of young

³ *Public Papers of the Presidents: John F. Kennedy, 1961*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. pp. 107-111.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 110.

men and women who will be entering upon higher education in the coming years."⁵

Bills to Amend NDEA Introduced

The administration's proposals to amend NDEA were embodied in identical bills (S. 1726 and H.R. 6774) introduced on April 27, 1961, in the Senate by Senator Lister Hill and on May 3, 1961, in the House of Representatives by Cleveland M. Bailey, Democrat of West Virginia. All of the proposals that Secretary Ribicoff had recommended in his April 21 letter to President Kennedy were included in these two bills. Representative Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat of Illinois, introduced his own bill, H.R. 7378, on May 13, 1961, just before the House hearings on NDEA amendments opened. However, the amendments proposed for title IV in his bill were identical to those proposed in the administration bills.

Two other bills of relevance to title IV of NDEA were introduced during the first session of the 87th Congress. S. 1227, introduced on March 7, 1961, by Senator Prescott Bush, Republican of Connecticut, extended the graduate fellowship program for 5 additional years and authorized 3,000 new fellowships to be awarded during each of these years. Such fellowships were to be for periods of study not in excess of three academic years, except that 500 of them each year were to be awarded for periods not in excess of one academic year needed to complete the doctorate. In the case of any such fellowship not used for the full time for which it was awarded, the Commissioner could reaward the fellowship for the unused period of time. Also, the Bush bill provided for a uniform subvention of \$2,500 to participating institutions for each academic year of study by a fellowship holder.

Another bill was that of Representative Carroll L. Kearns, Republican of Pennsylvania, ranking minority member of the House Education and Labor Committee. He claimed that his bill, H.R. 4253, which he introduced on February 13, 1961, was a more sound proposal than the administration bill and that "it adheres more closely to the principles upon which President Eisenhower based his recommendations for the enactment of this law."⁶ Mr. Kearns' bill proposed that the annual number of graduate fellowships authorized be increased from 1,500 to 2,500 and that a uniform payment of \$2,500 per fellowship per year be made to each participating institution.

1961 Congressional Hearings on Amendments to NDEA

Hearings on bills to amend NDEA were held in the Senate on May 13 and 14 and in the House on 10 days in June starting on June 1. In the Senate the hearings were conducted by the Subcommittee on Education, chaired

⁵ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 107, Part 5. 87th Congress, 1st Session. April 27, 1961. pp. 6786-87.

⁶ *National Defense Education Act*. Hearings Before Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor. House. Parts 1-4. 87th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 77.

by Senator Wayne L. Morse, Democrat of Oregon.⁷ In the House, hearings were conducted by three subcommittees of which the Special Subcommittee on Education, chaired by Representative Edith Green, Democrat of Oregon, was assigned the responsibility of holding hearings on amendments pertaining to the higher education titles of NDEA.⁸ During the first 2 days of the House hearings, however, all three subcommittees held joint hearings, chaired by Mr. Bailey, Chairman of the Subcommittee on General Education, because during these 2 days all aspects of NDEA were covered rather than specific titles of it.

In April of 1961 the U.S.S.R. orbited the first man in space. Thus, as the hearings opened, a situation existed which paralleled that period when the Soviets had accomplished their first space coup in 1957. The feeling during the hearings was that we were still in precarious competition with the U.S.S.R. in education. In his opening remarks, Senator Morse praised Senator Lister Hill and quoted Senator Hill's opening remarks in the hearings of 1958 regarding Russia's threat of superiority and the importance of education to America's survival.⁹

Senator Morse warned that unless we surpass Russia "through the full development of maximum brainpower, this Republic is through—and it is through in our time." He added, "I am not an alarmist, but it is with that attitude and approach to this problem that I am pleased and honored to open these hearings."¹⁰

In his remarks opening the House hearing, Mr. Bailey paid tribute to Senator Hill and Representative Carl Elliott, principal architects of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and then said:

"The Chair believes, in its brief lifetime, the National Defense Education Act has worked well, and has provided a vehicle to accomplish those things we hoped to accomplish. For this reason, and because of his participation in the original legislation, the Chair was happy to sponsor H.R. 6774, embracing the recommendation of the administration for extension and amendment. This does not necessarily mean he will support every change suggested in the bill. Neither does it mean that he will turn his back on other amendments that may be offered."¹¹

Administration Spokesmen Testify

In both the Senate and House hearings, the leadoff witness was Sterling M. McMurrin, who in February had

⁷ Other members of the Subcommittee were Democrats Lister Hill of Alabama, Patrick V. McNamara of Michigan, Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, Jennings Randolph of West Virginia; and Republicans Clifford P. Case of New Jersey, Jacob K. Javits of New York, and Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona.

⁸ Other members of the Special Subcommittee on Education were Democrats Robert N. Giaimo of Connecticut, John Brademas of Indiana, Neal Smith of Iowa; and Republicans Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, Charles E. Goodell of New York, and John M. Ashbrook of Ohio.

⁹ See page 11.

¹⁰ Senate hearings on *National Defense Education Act*, op. cit., p. 18.

¹¹ House hearings on *National Defense Education Act*, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

become U.S. Commissioner of Education. Immediately prior to becoming Commissioner, he had been Professor of Philosophy and Academic Vice President of the University of Utah. Dr. McMurrin asked that title IV be made permanent and that the number of fellowships be increased as recommended by President Kennedy on April 25.¹²

Two members of the joint subcommittee, Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., Republican of New Jersey, and Representative Robert P. Griffin, Republican of Michigan, told Commissioner McMurrin that they thought the expansion from 1,500 to 5,000 was very large and they would like to know the reason for an expansion of this magnitude. Commissioner McMurrin replied that "on the basis of very careful studies our office has determined that there is a very genuine need for this considerable expansion."¹³

In response to a question from Representative Albert H. Quie, Republican of Minnesota, on underutilized graduate facilities, Commissioner McMurrin stated that perhaps up to 20,000 additional fellows could be absorbed by institutions in this situation, if they did not have to meet the requirements of "newness" or "expansion." The Commissioner provided for insertion into the record of the hearings the list of institutions reporting unused capacity for additional doctoral candidates for 1960-61, as obtained from the 1959-60 Office of Education survey by John L. Chase.¹⁴

Commissioner McMurrin requested and received approval to have inserted into the record of the hearings in both the Senate and the House a lengthy statement titled "Review of Accomplishments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958 Together with a Discussion of Proposals for Amendment and Extension." The section on title IV covered five full pages of the hearings report.¹⁵

The other administration witness who testified in regard to title IV was Robert M. Rosenzweig who had been with the graduate fellowship program from the time it began until he became assistant to Commissioner McMurrin a few months before his appearance before the subcommittee. Dr. Rosenzweig briefly described the accomplishments of the program up to that time. He pointed out that every State in the Union, except Alaska and Nevada, was represented by an institution in the program. Nevada had no institution which offered doctoral level work and the University of Alaska had only a small program and had never applied.

Dr. Rosenzweig stated that the title IV program had made a major impact on the lives and academic careers of title IV fellows. He cited three findings resulting from the questionnaire sent by Dean Bent to the first 1,000 fellows in the program:

"First, they enabled a significant number of students to attend graduate school who otherwise could not have done so.

"Second, the average time which these students expect to take to earn their doctor's degree has been reduced by about 2 years, in terms of their own estimates of their expectations, because of the support they received under the act.

"Third, the fellowships have significantly altered the career plans of these students toward a career in college teaching."¹⁶

Dr. Rosenzweig also cited data to support the desirability of appointing replacements to unexpired fellowships. He stated that, of the first 1,000 fellows who were appointed for study beginning in 1959, 172 had dropped out and of the next group of 1,500, 101 had dropped out as of the time he was reporting.

Witnesses from the Higher Education Community

Testifying on behalf of the higher education community were a number of witnesses who presented the views of the major higher education associations on the bills being considered. All of them endorsed the proposed expansion of the graduate fellowship program from 1,500 to 5,000 new fellowships annually. There was considerable dissent, however, on the proposed provisions regarding the manner in which the 5,000 fellowships could be allocated. The administration's bills, S. 1726 and H.R. 6774, provided that, of the 5,000 fellowships authorized, up to 2,500 fellowships could be awarded under the conditions of the existing program, but no restriction was placed on the Commissioner in awarding the remainder of the fellowships except that preference should be given to persons interested in teaching in elementary and secondary schools as well as in institutions of higher education.

Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education, spoke on behalf of the Council as well as the American Association of Junior Colleges, the Association for Higher Education, and the Association of American Colleges. He said that although Commissioner McMurrin had testified on May 12 that he intended to use his authority for the awarding of additional fellowships in much the same manner as the associations he represented were proposing, "we do not believe, however, that policies of such great importance to higher education should be left entirely to one person's discretion. We strongly recommend, therefore, that the three types of fellowship programs we have recommended be written into the law."¹⁷

The three types proposed by Dr. Wilson were:

1. One program, providing additional fellowships each year for up to 2,500 students, would be identical with the existing program, as provided in H.R. 6774.

2. Another program, providing approximately 2,000 fellowships each year plus any not used in the quotas for programs 1 and 3, would be allocated to graduate schools under quotas to fill existing vacancies in programs of

¹² Ibid., p. 7.

¹³ Ibid., pp. 91-100.

¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 216-17.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 35-39.

¹⁶ Ibid., pp. 615-16.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 222. Asa S. Knowles, President of Northeastern University, Boston, represented these associations at the Senate hearings.

graduate instruction approved by the Commissioner, with no requirement of increased faculty or facilities.

3. An experimental program would provide a minimum of 500 1-year fellowships each year for college teachers who are within 1 year of completing the requirements for the doctorate. If the need for this program decreased in future years, the unused fellowships should be reallocated to program 2.

Dr. Wilson said that "no section of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 has greater present and potential importance to higher education than Title IV."¹⁸

Speaking on behalf of the State Universities Association and the National Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities on this matter was Eric A. Walker, President, Pennsylvania State University:

"We believe that all fellowships awarded under the National Defense Education Act except those for postdoctoral study or the completion of a final year of doctoral work should be awarded through graduate school on application, and not awarded on the basis of permitting the fellow to enroll in any institution of his choice which would accept him."¹⁹

Additional witnesses strongly urged that the fellowships be allocated to institutions which would in turn select the award winners, with a large number of them being used to fill up underutilized capacity in existing strong programs. Those urging this were Hans Rosenhaupt, National Director of the National Woodrow Wilson Fellowship Foundation; Alan D. Ferguson, Assistant Dean of Yale University Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, who was later to serve as Director of the National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program from July 1963, to March 1965; and John W. Ashton, Graduate Dean and Vice President of Indiana University, who was later to serve as Director of the Divisions of Graduate Programs during 1965-66. They feared that if this procedure were not followed, fellows would tend to congregate at a few prestigious institutions, making the rich graduate schools richer and the poor ones poorer. Dr. Rosenhaupt said that, in its existing form, the legislation might seriously interfere with private programs which operated in the same area.²⁰

Witnesses generally endorsed a uniform subsidy payment to institutions for each title IV fellow. Some thought that this subvention should be \$3,000—as suggested by Dean Henry Bent out of his year's experience as director of title IV programs—instead of the payment of up to \$2,500 as provided in the initial act.²¹

Dr. Ferguson (who incidentally favored 4-year fellowships rather than 3-year ones because he could remember only two students at Yale University over a 5-year period who had completed the doctorate in 3 years) was concerned about the provision that permitted the Commissioner to prescribe stipend amounts and dependency allowances. He

preferred to see more awards given at a small stipend level and greater use made of the student loan provisions of NDEA.

All witnesses were much in favor of the provision that would permit the unused time of vacated fellowships to be awarded to other qualified graduate students. They also favored the provision for some 1-year fellowships—up to 500 was the commonly accepted figure—to be awarded to all-but-dissertation students. There was no objection but little enthusiasm expressed for the provision to include as desirable fellowship candidates those students interested in teaching in elementary and secondary schools.

U.S. Chamber of Commerce Opposes Expansion of Title IV

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, through its Director of Education, submitted on May 12, 1961, a statement to Senator Morse opposing extension of NDEA, including title IV fellowships, on the grounds that it was originally enacted as an emergency undertaking to terminate after 4 years.

If, in spite of its objection, there still was to be an increased number of fellowships, the Chamber urged that the fellowships be limited to the humanities, the arts, and the social sciences because the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health were already granting a wide variety of fellowships in science.²²

Opposition to Title IV Fellowships Related to Theological Subjects

Representatives from three organizations (Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs; Protestant and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State; and American Civil Liberties Union) testified against the awarding of NDEA fellowships to persons pursuing studies in the area of religion. Specific objection was lodged against the award that had been made of three fellowships in Biblical studies to students at Emory University, a Methodist institution in Atlanta, and five fellowships to students at Union Theological Seminary, an interdenominational institution in New York City. Lawrence Speiser, Washington Director of the American Civil Liberties Union, called this "a clear violation of the principle of separation of church and State."²³ All three organizations requested that fellowships in the area of religion be excluded from the title IV program.

Clean Bill Reported by House

On June 28, 1961, the House Education and Labor Committee reported out a clean bill, H.R. 7904.²⁴ This bill provided that the title IV program be expanded to authorize the Commissioner of Education to award 5,000 3-year

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 221.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 560. Henry E. Bent, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Missouri, represented these associations at the Senate hearings.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 641.

²¹ Ibid., p. 680.

²² Ibid., p. 263.

²³ Ibid., p. 765.

²⁴ Report No. 674. House. 87th Congress, 1st Session. July 6, 1961. p. 80.

fellowships each year for fiscal 1962 and the succeeding 5 fiscal years. Up to 2,000 of this total were to be awarded to persons in new or expanded programs; up to 1,500 to persons in underutilized existing graduate programs; and the remaining number to be awarded by the Commissioner as he determined necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. The Commissioner was authorized to reaward unused portions of vacated fellowships. Preference was to be given to persons intending to teach in a college or university. Preference to those interested in teaching in elementary and secondary schools, as provided in the earlier bill (H.R. 6774) by Mr. Bailey, was dropped in the new version.

The amount of the stipend to be paid to a fellowship holder was to be determined by the Commissioner pursuant to regulations. The bill provided a cost-of-education allowance of \$2,500 per fellowship holder to be paid to an institution in the new or expanded program category; in remaining categories, \$2,000. No fellowship was to be awarded for study at a school or department of divinity or for study of theology or religion in preparation for teaching in a divinity school, or for service as a minister or in some other religious vocation.

In "Minority views," six Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee, while in favor of some expansion of title IV, were opposed to what they regarded an inordinately large expansion. The amended bill would allow for as many as 15,000 fellows in the third year of the program.²⁵ They argued that "such a large increase in the Title IV Program would, in our judgment, almost certainly result in discouraging privately financed fellowships and might well be injurious to the quality of graduate training."²⁶

Clean Bill Reported by Senate

On July 31, 1961, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported out a clean bill, S. 2345. This bill was introduced in the Senate that day by Senator Wayne Morse, who had conducted the Senate hearings on NDEA amendments. It replaced the earlier administration bill, S. 1726, introduced by Senator Lister Hill on April 27.

S. 2345 would make the title IV program permanent, as proposed by the administration, and increase the number of fellowships to 5,000 a year, with the duration of each fellowship to be determined by the Commissioner but in no case to exceed 3 years.

The 5,000 fellowships annually authorized under title IV would be divided into two categories. In the first category would be such number, not in excess of 2,500, as the Commissioner might determine, which would be awarded as were the 1,500 authorized by existing law in new or expanded programs approved by the Commissioner.

²⁵ These Members were Carroll D. Kearns of Pennsylvania, Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., of New Jersey, William H. Ayres of Ohio, Robert P. Griffin of Michigan, Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, and Peter A. Garland of Maine.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 77.

Such programs could be approved only for a 3-year period, although the Commissioner could extend the approval for another three-year period upon finding that such an extension was necessary to accomplish the objectives of this part of the title. The remainder of the 5,000 fellowships authorized for any fiscal year would be awarded for graduate study by students who had been accepted for enrollment at institutions of higher education.

S. 2345 also authorized the reaward of fellowships in cases where fellows had vacated them before the allotted time had expired. Only the unused period of the fellowship could be reawarded. The bill provided that, in the selection of fellows, preference was to be given to persons who, in writing, expressed their intention to teach in an elementary or secondary school or in an institution of higher education upon completion of their graduate work.

The bill provided that persons awarded fellowships would receive stipends for each academic year in such amounts, not in excess of \$5,000 for any postdoctorate fellowship or \$3,600 for any other fellowship, as might be prescribed by the Commissioner from time to time pursuant to regulations, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on account of each dependent. Institutions would be uniformly paid \$2,500 per fellow, per academic year, in new or expanded programs, and \$2,000 in other programs. However, these payments would be reduced by the amount of any tuition exacted of title IV fellows.

Finally, S. 2345 took two steps to indicate clearly to the Commissioner of Education the kinds of fellowships which should and should not be awarded under the title IV program.

1. It specifically excluded from eligibility all fellowships for graduate study at a school or department of divinity or religion, or graduate study of a religious or theological nature.

2. It inserted language limiting the fellowships to study in such subjects as the Commissioner deemed important to the national defense and which were consistent with the declaration of policy in section 101 of NDEA.

In its report to the Senate, the Committee was specific on the kinds of programs it felt were consistent with the purpose of NDEA:

"In thus restricting the Commissioner of Education, the committee does not intend to imply that only a very narrow selection of courses is related to the strength of the Nation. On the contrary, the committee believes that the strength of the Nation rests significantly upon overall excellence in college and university faculties in the humanities and social sciences, as well as in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern foreign language. Indeed a well-educated scientist or linguist is in need of exposure to excellent instruction in fields other than his specialty. However, the committee believes that in the light of the general objectives of this act, expenditures should be concentrated in those fields of study—science, engineering, humanities, and social sciences—which are closest to the defense needs of the Nation. The preparation of college

teachers in history, economics, and government, for example, is more directly related to a strong system of undergraduate training to meet the Nation's defense manpower needs, than are graduate programs in folklore or church music."²⁷

Minority Views

Senator Barry M. Goldwater, Republican of Arizona, and Senator John G. Tower, Republican of Texas, inserted a lengthy, joint minority statement (60 pages with appendixes) opposing many of the provisions of S. 2345, including those affecting title IV of NDEA. They were particularly concerned about the Committee's recommendation that three of the most important titles, including title IV, would be made permanent by the bill:

"When the National Defense Education Act was originally adopted in 1958, it was designed to meet an allegedly immediate emergency situation. Because no one could foretell either the duration of the emergency or how successful the bill would be in meeting it, all of the programs were established on a temporary basis—for a limited number of years."²⁸

With reference to title IV, the two Senators asserted:

"Experience until Title IV, the national defense fellowship program, inspires little confidence that this program will materially strengthen the national defense. During the past 3 years only about 27 percent of the fellowships awarded under the Act were in mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences—of the 3,840 fellowships awarded only three were in nuclear engineering, and a substantial number were in fields not even remotely related to defense.

"Thus, the proposal contained in the Committee bill to increase the number of fellowships awarded annually from 1,500 to 5,000 can only result in further disproportionate distribution of fellowships far removed from the national defense concept. The relatively small number of fellowships awarded to individuals studying mathematics, engineering, and the physical sciences is indicative of the fact that, if the fellowship program were restricted to the basic purposes of the Act, the Commissioner of Education would have found it difficult to dispose of all the fellowships available to him. In view of the excellent fellowship programs administered by the National Science Foundation and the Atomic Energy Commissioner, there is no justification for increasing the size of the fellowship program in this act."²⁹

In an appendix to their statement of minority views, the two Senators listed 25 programs, with 144 fellowships, which they said were specific examples of fellowships totally unrelated to national defense and to the professed purposes of the National Defense Education Act. This list included fellowships in the fields of home economics, music, drama and theater, fine arts, folklore, and religious studies.

²⁷ Report No. 652. Senate. 87th Congress, 1st Session. July 31, 1961.

²⁸ Ibid., p. 120-21.

²⁹ Ibid., p. 138.

Two-Year Extension of NDEA Passed

Neither H.R. 7300 nor S. 2345 reached the floor of the House or the Senate, respectively. President Kennedy had proposed a large amount of legislation. Back in April of 1961 Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, correctly predicted that the great amount of legislation to be considered would create a problem in getting legislation relating to higher education passed:

"The legislative traffic is heavy. In one session of Congress some 15,000 bills may be introduced. Still more important, the President has many other measures in which he is interested. Legislation on higher education must in this sense compete with bills on depressed areas, housing, health insurance for the aging and the minimum wage, to cite just a few major issues on which the President has pledged action."³⁰

Of greater consequence in the failure of H.R. 7300 and S. 2345 to reach the floors of their respective chambers was the controversy over the church-State issue of Federal aid to education. On May 25 the Senate, by a vote of 49 to 34, passed S. 1021, a bill providing Federal assistance to public school facilities. The House reported out a similar bill authorizing a 3-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities and to employ public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries, but the bill was bottled up in the Rules Committee and was not allowed to reach the floor of the House. The Rules Committee that year had been increased from 12 to 15 members, due to administration backing, in hopes of getting key legislation passed.

The Congressional Quarterly Service, in its publication *Federal Role in Education*, explained what took place:

"The House Education and Labor Committee June 1 reported a clean bill (H.R. 7300) authorizing \$2.5 billion in grants to the States for school construction and teachers' salaries. In the meantime, Catholics, with the help of House Majority Leader John W. McCormack, Democrat of Massachusetts, a Catholic, and the acquiescence of Health, Education, and Welfare officials, were seeking assurances that the NDEA bill with its provisions for loans to private school would be brought to the House floor in tandem with the public school bill. They feared that Congress would pass the public school bill and then kill the private school loan section of the NDEA. Their fears were not unjustified, for several Southern and border-State Congressmen who favored public school aid represented strongly Protestant constituencies which opposed aid to Catholic schools. Two Catholic Rules Committee members who ordinarily supported the Administration—James J. Delaney, Democrat of New York, and Thomas P. O'Neill, Democrat of Massachusetts—voted with the Committee's five Republicans and two Southern Democrats—Howard W. Smith of Virginia and William M. Colmer of Mississippi—to withhold

³⁰ John Brademas. "Higher Education and the 87th Congress," *Higher Education* (17:7). April 1961. pp. 6-7.

House floor action on the public school bill until the NDEA bill was reported to it.

"The House Education and Labor Committee promptly reported the NDEA bill (H.R. 7904), extending and amending the Act, with a provision of \$275 million in long-term, low-interest loans to private schools for classroom construction for the specified subjects. Nevertheless, the Rules Committee July 18 tabled (killed) ensemble the public school bill, the NDEA bill and the college aid bill (authorizing both grants and loans for classroom construction, plus college scholarships) which had also been reported. Voting to table the bills were all five Republicans, and three Democrats—Smith, Colmer, and Delaney. Although attention focused on Delaney's vote, three other Committee Southerners—Carl Elliott, Democrat of Alabama, Homer Thornberry, Democrat of Texas, and James W. Trimble, Democrat of Arkansas—were ready to table the NDEA bill had it come to a separate vote. Had this happened, there was little doubt—now that the lines of the controversy had hardened—that the public school bill could not have survived."³¹

In the other legislative house, the leadership decided not to bring S. 2345 to the floor of the Senate until they saw what was going to happen in the House. In the meantime, Public Law 815 and 874, which provided financial assistance to federally impacted areas and which had much congressional support, had expired on June 30, 1961. The administration had been urging a scaling down and eventual phasing out of this assistance and substituting in lieu thereof general school assistance. In addition, since the existing National Defense Education Act was scheduled to expire on June 30, 1962, there was great concern that much harm would be done to the continuity of a number of NDEA titles if no action on extending NDEA was taken before the adjournment of the first session of the 87th Congress. To resolve the problem, Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Democrat of New York, who that year had become Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, moved on September 6 the suspension of rules and the passage of H.R. 9000, which he had introduced at that time and which extended for 2 additional years the expired provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

In his remarks concerning H.R. 9000, Mr. Powell said:

"As chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, may I say that our sights for 1962 have been aimed at a tremendous increase of legislation in the field of higher education. I am not going to initiate any legislation in the field of school construction for elementary or secondary schools, nor teachers' salaries, unless I am directly requested by the President, as I was this time or unless the majority of my colleagues of the committee so decide. It is my personal opinion, and I may be totally wrong, that the temper of this House is of such nature that Federal aid to school construction per se, is dead for at least the

next year. I think it is deplorable, but we must face the stark, brutal, and disheartening fact and not dissipate the energies of this committee nor this House on that which will bring no results whatsoever.

"I do not think the mood of this House, in this era of atomic energy and astronauts, is keyed to higher education. For this purpose our Committee has brought out several bills, especially the higher education bill of the gentleman from Oregon (Mrs. Green) which received bipartisan support. We intend to press for passage of this bill during the remaining days of this year or the early days of next year.

"It is most important that we institute a crash program for training American young people in the sciences. Upon the basis of statistics prepared for me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and my very capable professional staff, I would like to announce the startling fact that by 1970, just 8 years from now, the Soviet bloc will have 15 million students enrolled in colleges and universities, and the free world will have only 7,500,000. They are outproducing us each year, and we will automatically become a second-class educational power.

"I know what I am about to say will be heartbreaking to those who believe in the humanities and the liberal arts, but I believe we cannot afford to continue to spend money disproportionately in those fields. The crisis is one of science. We are rapidly being lost sight of in the technological race for world survival. Therefore, whether we like it or not, we must, for a while, emphasize the sciences, even if it means deemphasizing the humanities. Otherwise, we might wake up one day to find that we have no humanity."³²

H.R. 9000 was passed by a roll call vote of 378 to 32. Representative James Roosevelt, Democrat of California and a supporter of NDEA, was one of those voting no. He felt that a 1-year extension, under the circumstances, was more desirable because "today we are being asked to freeze this act (NDEA), with all its imperfections, not for 1 year but for 2 years. And I do not see how anybody, in the interest of good legislation, can want to do that, particularly when this NDEA Act does not expire until the 1st of July next year."³³ The Quarterly Congressional Service explained that some Democratic House leaders wanted only a 1-year extension, leaving them a lever for school aid moves in 1962, but the price of the support of Representative Charles A. Halleck, Republican of Indiana, was a 2-year bill.³⁴ Mr. Halleck was Minority Leader in the House.

House-passed H.R. 9000 was received in the Senate on September 7, 1961, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had on August 15 reported out of Committee a bill (S. 2393) to extend for 1 year the temporary provisions of Public Law 815 and 874, the bills on federally impacted areas. S. 2393 had no provisions for

³¹ *Federal Role in Education*. Congressional Quarterly Service. Washington, D.C., 1965. p. 29.

³² *Congressional Record*. Vol. 107, Part 14. 87th Congress, 1st Session. September 6, 1961. p. 18244.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 18255.

³⁴ *Federal Role in Education*, op. cit., p. 29.

extension of NDEA. Senator Morse, who submitted the report of S. 2393, was against any simple extension of NDEA. He was holding out for the amendments to NDEA contained in S. 2345, and he was willing to wait until the next session of the 87th Congress to obtain the desired action. However, sentiment grew that the matter of extension should not be delayed because this would create serious problems of continuity of the act. President Kennedy himself became concerned and he sent a letter on September 9 to Senator Michael J. Mansfield, Democrat of Montana, who had taken over as Majority Leader when Senator Lyndon B. Johnson became Vice President, urging a one-year extension of school aid for impacted areas and NDEA. He said in this letter:

"An extension of these programs should make it possible for the Congress to make a careful review of their content and costs next year. School aid to federally impacted areas could then be re-examined to update its operation and effect possible economies. Also, the increased demands which are being thrust upon this Nation make it especially important that we give consideration next year to strengthening those provisions of the National Defense Education Act which improve the quality of education in this country.

"Therefore in my judgment a one year extension of school aid for impacted areas and the National Defense Education Act provides the best assurance that reevaluation of legislation affecting education will take place early next year."³⁵

On September 12, Senator A. S. Mike Monroney, Democrat of Oklahoma, offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 2393. The language of the amendment was that of the House-passed H.R. 9000, providing a 2-year extension of NDEA. Senator Morse, who, as mentioned before, was actually opposed to even a 1-year extension, offered two unsuccessful amendments to the Monroney amendment. One of his amendments was to extend for 1 year the provisions of law relating to assistance for schools in federally impacted areas. The other was to extend NDEA for 1 year. After the unsuccessful Morse amendments, the Monroney amendment was adopted by a roll call vote of 80 to 7, following which S. 2392 was passed by a voice vote.

S. 2393 then went to the House, where it was taken up on the floor on September 18 on the motion of Mr. Bailey. In commenting on S. 2393, Mr. Bailey noted that it was identical to H.R. 9000 which they had already passed. "It is now necessary," he said, "for the House to pass S. 2392 so that there is a bill with a common number to send forward to the White House."³⁶

Under suspension of rules procedure, because the first session of Congress was rapidly drawing to a close, the House passed S. 2393 by a roll call vote of 342 yeas to 18 nays.

President Kennedy signed S. 2393 into law on October 3,

1961, establishing Public Law 87-344. Thus the provisions of the National Defense Education Act were extended for another 2 years, with a new expiration date of June 30, 1964.

Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1962

Secretary Ribicoff was the leadoff witness in both the House hearings (March 14, 1961) and the Senate hearings (April 5, 1961) on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The administration was requesting \$211,207,000 in new obligational authority for fiscal year 1962 for Defense Educational Activities, including \$22,762,000 for National Defense Fellowships, an increase of \$2,012,000 over the amount appropriated for 1961.

Office of Education witnesses testified in the Senate on April 7 and in the House on April 12. In the House hearings, Peter P. Muirhead, Director of the Financial Aid Branch, was asked by Representative Winfield K. Denton, Democrat of Indiana about a program of folklore at Indiana University which had been criticized on the House floor by Representative H. R. Gross, Republican of Iowa. Mr. Denton said Mr. Gross had stated that it was difficult to understand why a course in American folklore should be supported by legislation that bore the title "National Defense Education Act." Mr. Denton wanted to know how such a program would be related to college teaching. Mr. Muirhead replied:

"This particular program in American Folklore was intended to provide training for college teaching in American literature. It was a fine program, well supported by the University and led to a Ph. D. with particular emphasis on American folklore in the larger discipline of the humanities."³⁷

Dr. McMurrin also defended the funding of the program and said that "sooner, or later, we are going to have to recognize that the real problem of American defense is tied up with the whole structure of our culture."³⁸

H.R. 7035 was reported out of the House Committee on Appropriations on May 15, 1961. The bill included an appropriation of \$210,857,000 for Defense Educational Activities, a reduction of \$350,000 from the administration's request but nevertheless \$23,377,000 over the amount appropriated for 1961. The net decrease of \$350,000 was composed of three items: (1) a decrease of \$1,000,000 from the \$22,762,000 requested for National Defense Fellowships; (2) a reduction of \$350,000 from the \$7,250,000 requested for institutes for counseling personnel, and (3) an increase of \$1,000,000 for area vocational education programs.³⁹

H.R. 7035 was taken up for consideration by the House on May 17, with John Fogarty floor manager for the bill. In his introductory remarks, he mentioned that it was his 15th consecutive year of working on the bill, the last 11

³⁵ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 107, Part 14, op. cit., p. 19058.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 18831.

³⁷ *Labor and Health, Education and Welfare Appropriation for 1962*. Hearings Before the Subcommittee of the Committee, Senate. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 359.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 359.

³⁹ *Report No. 392*, House. 87th Congress, 1st Session. p. 9, 10.

years as chairman. In each of those 11 years, the Committee had issued a unanimous report.⁴⁰ Among other provisions of the bill, he stated that there was a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the appropriation for graduate fellowships. He said that the reduction would "curtail the program expansion in 1962 but . . . not reduce any existing programs."⁴¹

Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, protested the cut.⁴² In answer to a query from a Member, Representative Melvin R. Laird, Republican of Wisconsin, ranking minority member of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having cognizance of the budgets for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, explained why the cut was made:

"We feel that the fellowships which have been approved by the Office of Education should be carefully scrutinized. I direct attention of the gentlemen to the record of the hearings of our committee, in which all of these fellowships as they were approved by the Office of Education are set forth. We feel that some of the fellowships approved are not in keeping with the intent of the National Defense Education Act as it was explained, as it was presented and as it was passed by the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. We feel that this needs review. Certainly an increase of \$1 million over last year's budget allows sufficient latitude for the Office of Education to carry on a very fine program but we want these programs and grants reviewed very carefully."⁴³

At the end of the House debate on H.R. 7035, Mr. Gross offered an amendment to the portion of the bill dealing with appropriations for Defense Educational Activities providing that "no part of the appropriations contained in this paragraph should be available for fellowships in the humanities and social sciences field." In offering his amendment, Mr. Gross said:

"I offer this amendment in order to try to get the National Defense Education Act back to where I am sure the Congress intended it should be; that is, to provide fellowships for the study of mathematics, physics, engineering, chemistry, and other similar sciences as an aid to the national defense effort of this country. This thing has gone far astray. We now provide fellowships for social studies, studies in humanities, and so forth. My amendment simply brings it back to where I think it should be. I know of no reason why under the National Defense Education Act there should be studies of the ecology and economics of flowing water, English folklore, and American folklore. What is the difference between English and American folklore? I will be pleased to have any member of the committee tell me the difference and why we should be providing fellowships under the National Defense Act to study folklore, jazz, the theater, and so forth."⁴⁴

⁴⁰ *Congressional Record* Vol. 107, Part 6. 87th Congress, 1st Session. May 17, 1961. p. 8233.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 8236.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 8249.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 8255.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 8268.

After a brief discussion, pro and con, Gross' amendment was rejected by a voice vote. Soon thereafter Mr. Fogarty moved that H.R. 7035 pass. The motion was agreed to by a voice vote. It was then sent to the Senate where it was referred, on May 18, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senate Committee on Appropriations reported out H.R. 7035 on July 25, 1961. The accompanying report, which was submitted by Senator Lister Hill, discussed several amendments which had been made to the House bill. For Defense Educational Activities, the Committee recommended an increase of \$850,000 over the House allowance and \$500,000 over the budget estimate. In regard to NDEA title IV fellowships, the report stated:

"The allowance for national defense fellowships was reduced by \$1 million by the House. The committee recommends an increase of \$500,000 in this item, the Department having advised that the remainder of the cut could be absorbed inasmuch as dropouts from the 1960 awards would reduce the estimated fund requirements by approximately that amount—and under the law the fellowship award cannot be transferred. This increase of \$500,000 will permit an additional 110 graduate fellowships to be awarded to students who are preparing for college teaching. In view of the impending doubling of enrollments in colleges and universities, the committee believes that this program, which is the only Federal program specifically designed to alleviate the college teacher shortage, should be supported at the maximum authorized level in 1962. This will permit a total of 1,500 new fellowships to be awarded.

"However, while recommending this support, the committee has indicated its concern about the fields in which some of the fellowships have been approved in the past years. The committee finds it difficult to understand the relationship between awards in some fields and national defense needs, and has included language in the bill which it hopes will guarantee that future approvals will be judiciously made in areas where there is the most urgent need for trained teachers and within the terms of the stated purpose of the Act as recited in Title I:

" 'It is therefore the purpose of the Act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States, and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.' "⁴⁵

H.R. 7035, as amended, was passed by the Senate on August 2, 1961. When the bill returned to the House, Mr. Fogarty moved that the House disagree with the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference requested by the Senate. Mr. Laird objected to the conference with the Senate until he had received from the administration a statement of opinion regarding the \$1 billion-plus that had been added onto the bill by Senate amendments. Mr. Laird quoted President Kennedy from his address of May 25 1961, to a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives in which he urged that "the current deficit

⁴⁵ *Report No. 618*. Senate. 87th Congress, 1st Session. July 25, 1961. p. 12.

be held to a safe level by keeping down all expenditures not thoroughly justified in budget requests." When Mr. Laird was assured by the White House and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that they supported the budget as presented to Congress and were opposed to increases over it, Mr. Laird withdrew his objection to the conference and conferees were appointed.

During this conference, the House conferees agreed to the \$500,000 restoration of the funds for the fellowship program as proposed by the Senate. On the other hand, the House conferees receded and accepted the language of the Senate with regard to the award of fellowships, namely, "that no part of the appropriation shall be available for graduate fellowships awarded initially under the provisions of the Act after the date of enactment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act of 1962, which are not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purpose of the Act

as stated in section 101 thereof."⁴⁶ The House accepted the conference report on September 11 and the Senate accepted it on September 12. The President signed H.R. 7035 on September 22, 1961, making it Public Law 87-290.

End-of-Year Activities

In March of 1961, Dean Bruce sent to the students who had been awarded fellowships beginning in the fall of 1960 a questionnaire similar to the one Dean Bent had mailed the previous year. As in the case of Dean Bent's questionnaire, the findings of the survey were not published but were used internally in the Office of Education for evaluation of the program and for preparation of justifications for congressional committees.

⁴⁶ *Conference Report No. 1154*, House, 87th Congress, 1st Session, September 7, 1961.

CHAPTER VI

fourth year of operation

Harold Howe, on leave as Dean of the Graduate School of Kansas State University and professor of agricultural economics, became the fourth head of the graduate fellowship program in July of 1961.

Dr. Howe's first action, in early July, was that of sending to participating institutions the new certification of enrollment forms, together with information on the new payment schedule and policy for stipends and dependency allowance for fellows. During the first three years, there was a separate certificate of enrollment form for each student. Under the new procedure, each new certificate of enrollment sheet provided for the certification of essential data on 20 fellows. With regard to payment of stipends and dependency allowances, title IV coordinators were informed that, instead of payments being mailed directly to the fellows, now the checks would be mailed from the U.S. Treasury, in separate envelopes addressed to the individual fellow, but in care of the title IV coordinator. First payments were scheduled to reach all participating schools on or about September 1 and subsequent checks for the sec-

ond semester and second and third quarters were scheduled to reach institutions by the beginning of the month in which the session began.

Title IV coordinators were also informed that no longer could payments be spread out so as to include payment during a summer session. Beginning with academic year 1961-62, no payments would be made for attendance at summer school even though summer session might be required of all fellows in the program. This change in procedure in no manner affected the institution's right to require fellows to attend summer school, nor did it affect the amount of money received by a fellow. It simply regularized the payments.

Commissioner Implements Congressional Recommendations on Eligible Fields of Study

As mentioned earlier, the Senate Appropriations Committee amended H.R. 7035, the appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Wel-

fare for fiscal 1962, by providing that no part of the appropriation could be used for new awards of fellowships which were not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purpose of the act as stated in section 101 thereof: namely, that "it is the purpose of this act to provide substantial assistance in various forms to individuals, and to States and their subdivisions, in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

When Commissioner McMurrin became apprised of the Senate Committee action, which took place on July 25, 1961, he wrote Senator Lister Hill, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on July 31. He said he was aware of the congressional attitude on fellowship awards and that "it will be my purpose to insure that new graduate programs and supporting fellowships established under this will be directed toward meeting the needs of our colleges and universities for well-trained teachers in those academic disciplines, including areas of the humanities and the social sciences that are basic or closely allied to the education and fullest development of our talented youth and to do so in such a manner as to contribute to the defense needs of the country." Senator Hill replied on August 5, "I am pleased to learn that you will personally concern yourself with the development of necessary policies and regulations which will insure that this title will be carried out in a manner which will fulfill the expectations held by Congress when this act was passed in 1958."

As a result of this exchange of letters, Assistant Commissioner for Higher Education Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., reported to the Commissioner on August 9 that he had taken three steps to gather information which would help in developing guidelines for approving title IV programs and fellowships for the 1962-63 academic year:

1. The Programs Branch of the Division of Higher Education would undertake to provide all available information about the current distribution of college teachers by basic undergraduate fields, and make projections of future needs for college teachers in these fields.

2. The Office of Scientific Personnel of the National Academy of Sciences would undertake a study designed to provide information about the undergraduate preparation of doctoral candidates in science, mathematics, and foreign languages; as well, it would examine the attitudes of these persons with regard to the value of their undergraduate preparations in all fields.

3. Some of the Title IV Advisory Committee members would convene in early September to prepare, with the information on hand, a tentative statement to be used in developing ground rules for choosing programs and fellowships for the academic year 1962-63.

On August 21, 1961, Dean Howe sent a memorandum to all title IV coordinators telling them that Congress had expressed concern about several of the fields in which NDEA fellowships had been approved in past years. He quoted from Commissioner McMurrin's letter to Senator Hill in which the Commissioner said he would insure that

fellowships would be awarded only in those academic disciplines, including those in the humanities and the social sciences, which contributed to the defense needs of the country. Dean Howe asked the coordinators to urge their departments, when preparing their applications for 1962-63, to propose only those programs which were clearly consistent with the language of the act and in accord with Commissioner McMurrin's statement.

A subcommittee of three members¹ of the Title IV Advisory Committee along with the Graduate Fellowship Section staff, met early in September of 1961 and, with the aid of the data that had been prepared for them, recommended that the following fields be considered eligible for priority consideration in the awarding of fellowships:

Agriculture	History
American studies	Mathematics
Anthropology	Modern foreign languages and linguistics
Biological sciences	Philosophy
Economics	Physical sciences
Education	Political sciences, including international relations
Engineering	Psychology
English	Sociology
Foreign area studies	
Geography	

Excluded from priority consideration were the fine and applied arts, ancient studies, and religion. Within the general area of the social sciences, lesser priority was to be given to those of an applied nature than to those that would serve the potential college instructor in teaching basic foundations at the undergraduate level.

The October 1961 Association of Graduate Schools Meeting

The Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) held its 13th Annual Conference in 1961 at New Orleans October 23-25. Dean Howe reported on the three recent developments which pertained to title IV. These were: (a) the failure of proposed substantive and technical amendments of NDEA to pass; (2) congressional censure of some title IV programs, culminating in the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee; and (3) the 2-year extension of NDEA.

Dean Howe pointed out that the bill prepared by the House Committee on Education and Labor and referred to the Rules Committee had proposed that 5,000 new fellowships be awarded annually. The bill limited to 2,000 the number of fellowships to be awarded under the "new or expanded" provisions of the program, allotted up to 1,500 fellowships to institutions to make use of present facilities

¹ The three Title IV Advisory Committee members were: Henry E. Bent, Dean, Graduate School, University of Missouri at Columbia; Robert H. Bruce, Dean, Graduate School, University of Wyoming; and Leonard B. Beach, Dean, Graduate School, Vanderbilt University.

Public announcement of the fields chosen to receive priority consideration under title IV was made in the November 1961 edition of the leaflet series, *NDEA AND HIGHER EDUCATION* (OE-50024-2), published by the Division of Higher Education, Office of Education. This leaflet regularly went to all institutions of higher education.

and to promote a wider geographical distribution of graduate facilities, and authorized the Commissioner to award at least 1,500 fellowships on such bases as he would determine. Dr. Howe also reported that the Graduate Fellowship Section staff had recommended to the Commissioner of Education that at least 1,000 of the additional fellowships be granted on a freedom-of-choice basis and that up to 500 be allocated to the so-called ABD's (all but dissertation).

The discussion which followed Dean Howe's presentation centered on the Senate's limitation of fields of graduate study under NDEA. All who spoke criticized the Senate action. Dean J. P. Elder of Harvard University said he hoped that the Title IV Advisory Committee would take the view that "the best-defended country is the country that is educated in all-around fashion in all the disciplines."² Dean John W. Ashton of Indiana University said that, although AGS could not instruct the members of the Advisory Committee, "it is essential that we continue to express as vigorously as possible the feeling that limiting these programs to areas that fall into a very narrow interpretation of this congressional statement would weaken the general program as well as represent a real misunderstanding among certain Congressmen as to the nature of graduate education."³

As a result of the discussion, a motion was passed unanimously that a statement expressing the views of AGS on this matter be sent to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. The following statement, prepared by Dean Bryce Crawford, Jr., of the University of Minnesota, and Dean Ashton, was transmitted to the Commissioner on January 3, 1962, by Everett Walters, Secretary-Treasurer of AGS and Graduate Dean of Ohio State University, who was to become in 1962-63 Director of the Graduate Fellowship Program.

"The Association of Graduate Schools (its Canadian members abstaining) urges that in the administration of the Title IV Fellowship Program of the NDEA, it be fully recognized that in the interest of the national defense, breadth of programs is essential; that such defense is not attained by the narrowly conceived training of scientists only in fully science-related fields, and that the undue restriction of fields in which fellowships are to be available is not in the national interests."⁴

The Competition for 1962-63 Fellowships

The institutional competition for 1962-63 fellowships began on October 29. Eleven consultants assisted the Title IV Advisory Committee in the evaluation of the 1,120 applications which had been received from 173 institutions. The Advisory Committee, of course, kept in mind the

² "National Defense Education Act, Title IV", *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the 13th Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools*. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1961. p. 125.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

Senate criticism of some of the past title IV program approvals.

In advance of the meeting, the Committee members and the consultants were provided with a list of the fields which were being suggested to them as worthy of high priority and those which were considered as ineligible for support. Because congressional concern had been directed toward the granting of fellowships in but a few subject-matter fields, a narrow selection of courses was not envisioned in the restrictions imposed by the Senate Appropriations Committee. On the contrary, the final objective was a strong system of undergraduate training resulting in a well-rounded education. "Undergraduate" was the key word in interpreting what were the basic disciplines. The objective of title IV was to train college and university teachers who presumably would be engaged in the teaching of undergraduate students. The fields of study in which all or most undergraduate students enroll would clearly be satisfactory. At the other extreme would be fields of study patronized by comparatively few students; naturally it was more difficult to justify these unless it could be shown that they were strategic in the national defense program.

To assist the Committee members and the consultants in their deliberation, the Graduate Fellowship Section staff had prepared a percent distribution of college teachers in relevant fields and a so-called ideal percent distribution in the formulation of which allowance was made for (1) the fellows in each field who, it was estimated according to available data, would not enter teaching careers and (2) the imbalance which then existed in the distribution among fields, of actual total fellowship assistance.

A problem in previous competition was that panelists were divided into subpanels expert in certain broad areas of knowledge. Although general guidelines were set up for all panels, it inevitably occurred that some panels graded high and some graded low, causing some inequities in final program approvals. To reduce the problem and also to approximate the "ideal" distribution which had been developed by the staff, the panelists in the various academic areas were asked to aim for a program approval formula which would apportion the 1,500 new fellowships within the following ranges:

Field	Percent range
Humanities	19-24
Education	9-14
Social sciences	21-26
Subtotal	53-58
Biological sciences	16-21
Physical sciences	14-19
Engineering	7-12
Subtotal	42-47

As a result of the competition, 571 programs were approved at 157 colleges and universities for the 1962-63

academic year. Alaska was the only State which did not have a program. Of the 571 programs to be supported, 398 had received support in past years and were being allocated additional fellowships. The remaining programs were being supported for the first time. The full authorized total of 1,500 fellowships were allocated to the 571 approved programs. A total of 5,621 fellowships had been requested in the 1,120 applications which had been submitted.

Fifty-six percent of the fellowships allocated were in the nonscience areas (humanities, education, and social sciences) down 5 percent from the previous year, and 44 percent were in the science areas (biological and physical sciences, and engineering) up 5 percent from the previous year. This considerable shift in one year was clearly a consequence of the recent congressional action.

Advisory Committee Meeting of October 31, 1961

Following the sessions on the allocation of fellowships, the Advisory Committee held a policy meeting on October 31. One resolution discussed was the following:

Resolution: "We enthusiastically commend the Commissioner for his statement before the Title IV panels in support of Federal aid to graduate education broadly interpreted. The restrictions placed upon the operation of the Title IV programs during the current year are most unfortunate and we hope will be removed at the earliest possible date."

This resolution evoked a great amount of discussion. Opinion was expressed questioning the validity of the assumption that title IV was supposed to assist graduate education across the board. It was suggested that the first sentence be reworded to commend the Commissioner for his statement "in support of a broad and liberal interpretation of the Title IV program." This wording was rejected in favor of the original. However, concern was expressed regarding the original resolution, for it sounded as if the group was going on record as favoring across-the-board Federal aid to graduate education. It was decided to table the resolution until the next policy meeting of the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee passed another resolution strongly urging that every effort be made to continue the appointment of a graduate dean or person with similar experience as administrator of the title IV program. During the discussion of this resolution the suggestion was made that appointments be made for 2 years rather than 1 year.

Hearings on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1963

The hearings on appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare opened before the House Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on January 30, 1962, John Fogarty presiding. HEW Secretary Abraham Ribicoff—accompanied by Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary, and James F. Kelly, Department Budget

Officer—was the leadoff witness. The Department's request for Defense Educational Activities, which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget, was \$229,450,000, including \$21,200,000 for NDEA fellowships.

Office of Education witnesses were called to testify on February 20. Mr. Fogarty asked Commissioner McMurrin what had been done since the previous years as a result of congressional criticism. Dr. McMurrin replied that "we have changed the regulations to eliminate fellowships in several fields: fellowships in the field of religion, fellowships in the field of ancient studies, and fellowships in the fine arts."⁵ Mr. McMurrin then called upon Kenneth W. Mildenberger, who had become Director of the Financial Aid Branch when Peter Muirhead became Assistant Commissioner for Legislative and Program Development, for elaboration. Dr. Mildenberger said that the Office of Education had denied approval to 47 programs which had been approved in previous years. At Mr. Fogarty's request, Dr. Mildenberger entered into the record of the hearings the names of these programs and the institutions which had requested approval of them.

Dr. McMurrin stated that he had administered the fellowship title the previous year according to the purposes of the act as interpreted by the Congress, but he was not happy about the limitations which had been imposed:

"I would like to say that we have been subjected to very severe criticism at this point from various academic groups and I personally believe that the principle upon the basis of which this criticism has been offered is a principle very worthy of consideration by the members of this committee and the members of Congress. I personally believe that the principle is a sound one. It is simply the recognition, as I stated last year before this committee, that in the long run the strength and security of the Nation depend upon the quality of the educational programs as a whole; that the humanities and the fine arts contribute very importantly and in a very fundamental way to the strength of our society as well as to the quality of our culture. I believe personally that it is an unfortunate thing that the National Defense Education Act does not clearly allow for the awarding of fellowships on a broader basis in the field of the fine arts and the humanities. So that, although we have undertaken to adhere rigorously to the requirements of the law, I believe nevertheless that the criticism of our action is based upon the very sound principle that the national strength calls for a broad program of improvement of education in all fields."⁶

In support of his position, he received permission from the chairman to insert into the record of the hearings the resolutions passed by the Association of Graduate Schools (AGS) in October 1961 and by the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) at its annual meeting of Janu-

⁵ Department of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations for 1963. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. House, 87th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. p. 659.

⁶ Ibid., p. 660-61.

ary 21, 1967. The AGS resolution was quoted earlier in this chapter. The ACLS resolution follows:

"Resolved, that this council regards it as imperative, in the national interest and for strengthening of American education on the broadest possible front, that the Federal Government extend its support of summer and academic year institutes for secondary school teachers to include the basic humanities and social studies on the same basis as modern foreign languages, mathematics, and the natural sciences.

"Resolved, that this council very strongly urges that the Federal Government in the national interest and for strengthening of our scholarly and intellectual resources on the broadest possible front, extend its support of higher education and research to include all the humanities and the social sciences on the same basis as mathematics, the natural sciences, and technology."⁷

The Senate hearings on HEW appropriations opened before Senator Hill's subcommittee on March 6, 1962, with an appearance by Secretary Ribicoff, followed by Commissioner McMurrin on March 16. Dr. McMurrin explained that the appropriation requested for national defense fellowships represented a decrease of \$170,800 from the fiscal year 1962 appropriation to take account of an annual average dropout rate of 7 percent during the first 3 years of the program.⁸ He stated that the 1963 budget estimate of \$21,200,000 would continue the program at the 1962 level of operation.

When Dr. McMurrin mentioned that the Office did not have the authority under the existing law to fill vacated fellowships, Senator Hill asked him if he would like such authority. Dr. McMurrin said that he would like to have it very much. As he had done before the House Appropriations subcommittee, Dr. McMurrin urged that a liberal interpretation of title IV be taken in relation to fields considered vital to the national security and the national defense. He said that he knew Senator Hill agreed with him in principle on this position.⁹

The Labor-HEW appropriations bill, H.R. 10904, was reported from the House Committee on Appropriations on March 23. It contained the full appropriation requested for Defense Educational Activities. H.R. 10904 was reported out of the Senate on June 29, with the amount for Defense Educational Activities unchanged. The Senate Report of the bill stated that the \$21,200,000 authorization for fellowships was the amount necessary to provide the total number of authorized fellowships: 1,500 new, 1,290 second-year, and 1,298 third-year fellowships.¹⁰ The House passed an amended bill (no amendments to NDEA appropriations, however) on August 1 and the Senate on

August 2. The President signed it into law (Public Law 87-582) on August 14, 1962. The law still contained the clause which had appeared in the law of the previous year and which had been written into H.R. 10904 by the House subcommittee and accepted by both the House and the Senate: namely, "That no part of this appropriation shall be available for graduate fellowships awarded initially under the provisions of the Act after the date of enactment of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Act of 1962, which are not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purpose of the Act as stated in section 101 thereof."

Advisory Committee Meeting of April 28, 1962

The Committee was convened for the purpose of discussing a number of policy matters. Before this discussion began, committee members were given a briefing on the legislative situation by Dr. Mildenerberger who had testified at hearings on appropriations for 1962-63. He explained that H.R. 7904 was reported by the House Education and Labor Committee on July 6, 1961, and tabled by the House Rules Committee on July 18, 1961, and that S. 2345 was reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on July 31, 1961, but was not acted upon by the full Senate. He said these bills were technically not yet dead but were not likely to be approved since Congress had in the fall of 1961 extended NDEA for 2 years, without substantive changes. Dr. Mildenerberger indicated, however, that the Department was expecting to submit to the Congress convening in 1963 essentially the same amendments to NDEA as it had in 1961. These amendments called for:

1. Establishment of the graduate fellowship program on a permanent basis.
2. Increase in the number of annual awards to 5,000, no more than 2,500 of which would be in new or expanded programs.
3. Payments to institutions of a fixed sum of \$2,500 per fellow for new or expanded programs and \$2,000 per fellow for other awards.

One of the policy matters discussed by the Advisory Committee was whether or not there should be a definite limit on the number of years a program might be continued. It was noted that 93 of the 272 programs which launched title IV in the fall of 1959 had received 4 years of support. Committee members were also reminded that the instructions for preparing applications for 1963-64 programs had stated that if a program had received fellowship support for 4 years the applicant would need to produce a strong case for the granting of additional fellowships. Attention was also directed to the fact that H.R. 7904 and S. 2345 of the current session of Congress limited the period of approval for new or expanded graduate programs to 3 years, with the possibility of extending such approval for a succeeding 3-year period.

No resolution was passed but there seemed to be a consensus that support beyond 4 years should be permitted

⁷ Ibid., p. 662.

⁸ *Labor-Health, Education and Welfare Appropriations for 1963*. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Senate. 87th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. p. 1055.

⁹ Ibid., p. 1064-65.

¹⁰ *Report No. 1672*. Senate. 87th Congress, 2d Session. June 29, 1962. p. 13.

when justified. It was generally agreed that the development of a really good Ph. D. program was a long-range undertaking and that the resources available to many schools were not sufficient to maintain the accelerated growth that they had gained. Concern was expressed by some Committee members that the establishment of an arbitrary 4-year limit might tend to stimulate newness for its own sake rather than for the sake of solid and needed program development. A specific limitation might also give credence to the criticism that title IV was spawning weak programs.

Another policy matter discussed but not acted upon at the meeting was the question of whether or not there should be some attempt to consciously manage the distribution of fellowships between first-time and continuing programs. What had been done in the past had been done without such planning. The number of applications for continuing support had gone up each year while the percentage of approval of them had gone down, as shown by the following tabulation:

	Competition during		
	Fall 1959 for 1960-61	Fall 1960 for 1961-62	Fall 1961 for 1962-63
FIRST-TIME APPLICATIONS			
Number of program applications	709	564	585
Number approved	202	204	173
Percent approved	28%	36%	30%
Average number of fellowships per program	4.0	3.3	3.2
APPLICATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL FELLOWSHIPS			
Number of active programs	272	474	678
Number of these programs applying for additional fellowships	209	384	535
Number approved	202	321	398
Percent approved	97%	84%	74%
Average number of fellowships per program	3.5	2.6	2.4

A problem that had come up in past competitions was that of a department of a university submitting more than one program proposal. The Advisory Committee agreed that if a department wanted to strengthen its program in two or three areas, it would be permitted to do so, but it should send in only one program application. The number of fellowships requested should reflect the fact that several areas were to be supported. This instruction was included in a May 1 memorandum from Dean Howe to all title IV coordinators. The memorandum transmitted application forms and instructions for title IV programs for 1963-64. It included the instruction that applications had to be submitted by October 15, 1962.

Mr. Muirhead, who attended part of the meeting, asked Committee members for their advice regarding ways in which the new proposed fellowship programs might be set up. To assist them in this task, the Office agreed to furnish Advisory Committee members with a brief sum-

mary of the general direction the programs might be expected to take. The following portion of this summary sent out to Advisory Committee members on May 10, 1962, reveals what the thinking was in the Office with regard to the handling of the 5,000 fellowships being proposed to Congress:

"In testimony in House hearings, representatives of higher education stressed repeatedly the need for supplying fellowships to institutions which now have strong programs but underutilized facilities. Of somewhat equal importance, were expressions of fear that a large proportion of the 5,000 fellowships might go to a relatively few institutions in which there is now a high concentration of students who are holders of fellowships from other government agencies as well as private agencies.

"In the event of Congressional acceptance of the Title IV amendments, the Graduate Fellowship Branch has favored recommending to the Commissioner that, in addition to continuing the plan of support for 'new or expanded' programs, we would set up a companion plan under which institutions with underutilized capacity would apply for approval of graduate programs. Those programs receiving approval would receive an allotment of fellowships, and the institutions themselves would then nominate students for fellowship awards. Together, these two plans probably would account for approximately 3,500 of the 5,000 fellowships.

"The remaining 1,500 fellowships would be awarded directly to students, and would thus tend to concentrate fellows in the prestigious institutions unless some steps were taken to mitigate this effect. But this effect is desirable in some respects. Certainly, those universities which lead in production of doctorates would welcome an opportunity to participate much more extensively in the Title IV program than they do at present. Of these remaining 1,500 fellowships, however, about 400 would be awarded to students who had completed all of their work toward the doctorate except the dissertation, and who had the endorsement of their institutions that they would be expected to complete the doctorate in one year. These one-year awards would go to institutions in approximately direct proportion to their present relative production of doctorates and thus would not pile up disproportionately at prestigious schools.

"Not including the possibility of a post-doctoral plan, only about 1,000 of the 5,000 fellowships would be awarded in such a way as to cause the kind of concentration at prestigious institutions concerning which fear has been expressed. The other 4,000 would have the selective impact preferred by the majority of the academic community, and could be awarded in a way to compensate for any imbalance to which the freedom of choice awards might lead."

End-of-Year Activities

On April 1, 1962, the Office of Education was reorganized into bureaus which grouped the Office's activities

by function rather than by curriculum level. The Financial Aid Bureau became the Division of College and University Assistance within the Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs. The Graduate Fellowship Section of the old Financial Aid Branch was renamed the Graduate Fellowship Branch and the title of the head of the program was elevated from Chief to Director.

The spring of 1962 saw the issuance of a new, attractive eight-page brochure, *Your National Defense Graduate Fellowship*, which contained vital information for title IV fellowship holders. Also issued that spring was a new edition of *The National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program: A Manual for Participating Graduate Schools*. This new version contained several of the policy decisions which had been made since 1960 and included in the appendixes the new forms being used. Under a section titled "Institutional Applications" were listed the following updated criteria used to guide the Title IV Advisory Committee in approving programs:

(a) The prospective ability of the applying institution, in terms of faculty, libraries, and equipment, competently to offer the program;

(b) Current or prospective national or regional shortage of college or university teachers in the proposed field;

(c) Current or prospective national or regional inadequacies in the offering of proposed subjects;

(d) Adequate ratio, at the applying institution, between the number of graduate faculty and the proposed number of graduate students;

(e) The amount and extent of the applying institution's previous planning and development in the field proposed in the program;

(f) Likelihood that the applying institution will be able soundly to support the proposed program on a long-term basis;

(g) Likelihood that the proposed program will produce teachers for institutions of higher education;

(h) The urgency of the need to train college-level teachers in the field of study concerned in order to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States.

In June of 1962, at which time most title IV fellows of the first class entering in the fall of 1959 were completing their first 3 years of tenure, the Graduate Fellowship Branch sent out to institutions of higher education a list of fellows who had finished their 3 years of study under NDEA and had recently indicated that they would be interested in hearing about college teaching positions which might be available. The list gave the fellows' names, graduate schools, fields and permanent addresses.

CHAPTER VII

fifth year of operation

Everett Walters, Dean of the Graduate School of Ohio State University and a historian, took over in July of 1962 as the fifth head of the title IV program. Because policies and procedures had become quite well settled during the preceding 4 years of operation there were no significant changes in operations during 1962-63. One exception was the initiation of an "Oath and Information" form to replace the "Oath and Affidavit" which had been in use up to that time. This change was brought about by passage on October 16, 1962, of Public Law 87-835 repealing the requirement that a student sign an affidavit stating that he did not believe in, was not a member of, and did not support any organization which advocated the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional means. The full story of the controversy over this affidavit is described in chapter XIV of this report.

The new Oath and Information form which each fellowship applicant had to submit required a notarized oath of allegiance to the United States of America and a listing

of any crimes (other than those committed before the 16th birthday and minor traffic violations for which a fine of \$25 or less was imposed) of which the applicant had been convicted, or criminal charges placed against him which were punishable by confinement of 30 days or more and which were pending against him at the time of application. The applicant was informed that no application would be automatically ruled invalid if the applicant listed crimes and conviction or pending charges. The information was simply to be considered by the U.S. Office of Education in weighing the suitability of the applicant as an NDEA fellow. All information was to be treated confidentially.

The fellowship applicant was also enjoined to read the law on the reverse side of the Oath and Information form, which stated that:

"When any Communist organization, as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 is registered or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such

organizations to register, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization with knowledge or notice that such organization is so registered or that such order has become final (i) to make application for any payment or loan which is to be made from funds part or all of which are appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under the authority of this Act, or (ii) to use or attempt to use such payment or loan. Whoever violates (the above) shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both."

The applicant was informed that, as of October 31, 1962, the following organizations were registered or were required to register under the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950: the Communist Party of the United States of America; the California Emergency Committee; and Connecticut Volunteers for Civil Rights.

Committee Set Up to Recommend Procedures in Regard to Criminal Records

The new law requiring fellowship applicants to disclose any criminal records required, of course, the establishment within the Office of a procedure whereby such cases could be reviewed and decisions made. For this reason, Kenneth W. Mildener, Director, Division of College and University Assistance, formed in the fall of 1962, an Ad Hoc Committee on Criminal Records Procedures chaired by C. E. Deakins, Director of Field Operations in the Division. Members of the Committee included Dean Walters of the Graduate Fellowship Branch, his assistant, James H. Blessing, who had rejoined the Graduate Fellowship Branch the preceding year. Also included were representatives of title VI, the Language Development Branch, because of the fellowship program they administered.

In January of 1963, the Committee recommended that the normal professional review of the qualifications of applicants be kept separate and apart from any consideration to be made on the basis of criminal record information submitted by the candidate. In order that complete objectivity might be maintained and tentative selection of candidates be made on the basis of scholarly achievement and potential, the Committee agreed that at no time should any advisory group or panel involved in the selection of fellows be made aware of the nature of any criminal declarations, affirmative or negative, made in connection with any application.

The Committee recommended that statements containing affirmative declaration of candidates tentatively selected for fellowships be forwarded to a special "review committee" appointed by the Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Assistance, for consideration and further processing. After review by this committee, it was recommended that the statements be returned to the appropriate program office. The report of the "review committee" was then to be forwarded to the Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Assistance, through the Director, Division of College and University Assistance.

The Committee felt that it was impossible at that time

to come up with definitive criteria for determining categories of crime for which a candidate should be rejected. Rather, they suggested that each case be considered on its own merits and that after a period of time some useful criteria might be developed.

In addition to giving power to the Commissioner of Education to refuse to award a fellowship when he was of the opinion that such award was not in the best interests of the United States, the law also permitted him to revoke a fellowship for the same reason. The Committee felt that different procedures were needed in such cases and that the rights of the individual should be fully protected. In any case involving unproved allegations, notice to the applicant and an opportunity for an administrative hearing were urged as serving both the cause of justice and the proper administration of the statute.

The Committee recommended that the Commissioner delegate to the Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Assistance, authority to rule favorably that an award was not in violation of the best interests of the United States when circumstances so indicated, reserving to himself the authority to deny or revoke an award where such action seemed advisable.

Committee Recommendations Implemented

The recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee were accepted by Commissioner Francis Keppel and were printed in the *Federal Register* of August 16, 1963, under the title *Procedures and Criteria for Resolving Questions Involving Moral Character or Loyalty of Applicants for and Holders of NDEA Fellowships*.¹ The regulations stated that "an NDEA fellowship would be denied or discontinued where: (1) the oath or affirmation of allegiance was not taken or could not be taken in good faith; or (2) there is (i) a conviction of a crime involving moral turpitude or (ii) conduct involving moral turpitude, unless it is established that the applicant or fellowship holder is, nevertheless, now a person of good moral character."

The *Register* prescribed the procedures to be followed in case a fellowship was denied or revoked. These procedures included notice to the individual affected, setting forth in as much detail as possible and as specifically as considerations of security could permit, the information raising questions pertaining to moral character or loyalty and advising that unless a request for a hearing was made within 20 days of the mailing of the notice, the fellowship was denied or revoked. The procedures to be followed by a department fellowship review panel in case of an appeal were outlined.

Competition of October 1962 for 1963-64 Fellowships

The deadline for receipt of applications for 1963-64 fellowships was October 15, the same date as the preceding year. The evaluation of the applications by the Title IV Advisory Committee, assisted by 11 consultants repre-

¹ *Federal Register*. Title 45, Part 147, Chapter I. August 16, 1963.

senting six major academic areas, took place during the last 4 days of October.

The panelists were informed that the target distribution of the 1,500 new fellowships among the six academic areas would be the same as the preceding year. This distribution, it will be recalled, was based upon the actual distribution of college teachers in fields of study supported under title IV, adjusted to take account of the percentage of Ph. D.'s who might be expected to enter college teaching in each of the six areas and the amount of fellowship assistance available in each. The panelists were asked to recommend an allocation of fellowships which did not vary by more than 38 (2.5 percent of the 1,500) from the following target numbers of fellowships: humanities, 318; social sciences, 345; education, 171; biological sciences, 278; physical sciences, 241; and engineering, 147.

The panelists were urged to give numerical ratings for the separate items of evaluation and, in particular, to make written comments at the bottom of the rating sheet, giving the salient reasons for low- or middle-range ratings. The Graduate Fellowship Branch was being besieged each year with requests as to why programs were not approved.

The panelists' attention was also drawn to the statement made in the instructions sent that year to institutions applying for additional fellowships in an approved program: "If the program has received fellowships for four years, the applicant will need to produce a strong case for the granting of additional fellowships." The panelists were informed that the consensus of the Advisory Committee at its April meeting that year was that this should not imply any prejudice against a fifth year of support.

At the end of the competition the Commissioner announced, on December 3, 1962, the approval of 623 graduate fellowship programs at 155 colleges and universities for the 1963-64 academic year. For the first time, with the approval of two graduate fellowships at the University of Alaska, all 50 States and the District of Columbia were represented.

Approvals were granted from among 1,175 applications submitted by 172 institutions requesting a total of 5,600 fellowships. Of the 623 that were to be assisted in 1963-64, 431 had received support in previous years and were being allocated additional fellowships. The remaining 192 programs were being supported for the first time. Of the 1,500 fellowships allocated, 55 percent went to nonscience areas—the humanities, education, and social sciences.

Aside from its primary purpose, the fellowship competition review served, as usual, to bring the title IV membership together to consider policy and other matters. At this particular meeting were discussed the recent removal of the disclaimer affidavit requirement from NDEA and the following title IV amendments which were under consideration for proposal to Congress:

1. The Commissioner be authorized to provide for as many as 5,000 fellowships per year.

2. The Commissioner be authorized to establish fellowships at institutions which demonstrate unused capacity in existing doctoral programs.

3. The Commissioner be authorized to establish 1-year fellowships for college and university teachers who need to complete requirements for doctoral degrees.

4. Uniform payment of \$2,500 per year for each fellow be given to participating institutions.

5. The Commissioner be authorized to appoint substitutes to fellowships vacated before their full term is used.

Report of the President's Science Advisory Committee on December 12, 1962

On December 12, 1962, the President's Science Advisory Committee issued its first report, *Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology*.² This report concerned graduate training in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences, designated as "EMP" fields. The Committee urged that the Nation direct its efforts toward achievement of four goals:

1. Increase the number of doctor's degrees awarded each year in EMP to reach 7,500 in 1970.

2. Increase the number of students who complete a full year of graduate training in EMP to reach 30,000 during 1970.

3. Encourage the strengthening of existing centers of excellence in EMP and develop new centers of educational excellence.

4. Promote wider geographic distribution of centers of educational excellence.

This report had an impact on the 1963 request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for expansion of the NDEA graduate fellowship program. Previous to this time, the intention had been to request an expansion to 5,000 fellowships, as was sought in 1961. But Jerome B. Wiesner, Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology and Chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee, telephoned the Office of Education and stated that, in view of the recommendations in the report, the Department should ask authority for 10,000 new title IV fellowships each year in its 1963 request to Congress. Since Dr. Wiesner's request was in reality a White House recommendation, the draft bill submitted to the White House in early January contained a provision for increasing the number of new 3-year fellowships from the then existing level of 1,500 to 10,000 each year.

President Kennedy's 1963 Message on Education

On January 29, 1963, President John F. Kennedy transmitted to the Congress his message on education, titled *Program for Education*. "Education is the keystone in the arch of freedom and progress," he said. "Nothing has contributed more to the enlargement of this Nation's strength and opportunities than our traditional system of free, universal elementary and secondary education coupled with widespread availability of college education." He

² *Meeting Manpower Needs in Science and Technology, Report No. 1: Graduate Training in Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, pp. 6-8.

recommended an omnibus program of Federal aid to education that was the most comprehensive ever proposed. He urged a large expansion in the support of graduate education. Noting that only about one-half of 1 percent of the school-age generation was achieving Ph. D. degrees in all fields, he recommended that the number of NDEA fellowships be increased from 1,500 to 12,000, including summer awards.

The President also recommended enactment of a Federal grant program to be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the development and expansion of new graduate centers; also, expansion of the National Science Foundation's program of science development grants for the strengthening of graduate education. In support of this recommendation, the message said:

"We need many more graduate centers, and they should be better distributed geographically. Three-quarters of all doctoral degrees are granted by a handful of universities located in 12 States. The remaining States with half our population produce only one-fourth of the Ph. D.'s."³

National Education Improvement Act of 1963—Bills Introduced

The President's message of January 29 included a draft of a bill titled "National Education Improvement Act of 1963." On that date the bill, as proposed by the President, was introduced in the Senate as S. 580 by Senator Wayne Morse for himself and nine other Democratic Senators, and in the House as H.R. 3000 by Representative Adam Clayton Powell, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. The identical bills were 182 pages long and contained 24 major parts, grouped into the following six titles:

- I. Expansion of Opportunities for Individuals in Higher Education
- II. Expansion and Improvement of Higher Education
- III. Improvement of Educational Quality
- IV. Strengthening Elementary and Secondary Education
- V. Expansion and Improvement of Vocational and Special Education
- VI. Expansion of Continuing Education

Part D of title I was titled "Graduate Fellowships." This part of the bill extended the National Defense Fellowship Program under title IV of NDEA 2 years beyond the existing expiring authority of June 30, 1964, and increased the number of fellowships, beginning in fiscal 1964, from 1,500 to 10,000. No fewer than 1,500 fellowships would be awarded to students in the approved new or expanded programs for training of college-level teachers still be awarded to students in the approved new or existing (fellowships under the existing program were limited to these) with the rest awarded on such basis as the Commis-

sioner of Education might determine. Preference would continue to be given to persons pursuing doctorates and intending to be college or university teachers. The refilling of vacated fellowships would also be authorized.

The bill would establish a program of summer session fellowships, authorizing 2,000 annually during the fiscal years 1964 through 1966. Such fellowships would be available only to students who were college or university teachers during the preceding year and to students engaging in full-time graduate study during the preceding or succeeding academic year but who were without a fellowship under the NDEA or any other Federal program.

Under the bill, the Commissioner would by regulation prescribe the amounts of the fellowship stipends. He would also by regulation prescribe cost-of-education allowances for the institutions of higher education; this would be uniform among the institutions, after considering the average cost of education for various categories of fellows.

Part E of title II, "Graduate Schools," authorized grants to institutions of higher education to assist them in improving existing graduate schools or in establishing new ones of high quality (including necessary construction and equipment). Forty million dollars would be authorized for fiscal year 1964, and such sums as the Congress might determine would be authorized for fiscal years 1965 and 1966. Additionally, there would be authorized for the 4 years following fiscal year 1966 sums necessary to continue initial support (for a total of not more than 5 years) of the schools for which a grant was approved in any of the first 3 years of the program.

Grants would be used to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of construction and up to 50 percent of other costs of graduate schools meeting the standards of scope and quality established by the Commissioner with the advice of an advisory committee.

In making grants, consideration was to be given to the extent to which a project would contribute to the achievement of the objectives of part E, title II. These objectives were to promote the national security and growth by increasing the supply of highly skilled personnel critically needed by industry, government, research and teaching. Consideration was also to be given to the promotion of wider geographical distribution of high quality graduate schools. Grants could not be used for sectarian religious instruction or for any school or department of divinity, or for any facility to be used for such programs.

Hearings on H.R. 3000

Hearings on the administration's bill opened in the House on February 4, 1963, and continued for 11 additional days, ending February 27, 1963. In his opening remarks, Mr. Powell stated that, while he favored an omnibus approach to the problems of education, he was not optimistic about the chances for approval of this approach:

"I want to be politically realistic and point out that this bill as it is now before us might not come out of the Committee on Education and Labor, probably would not

³ Special Message to the Congress on Education. January 29, 1963. *Public Papers of the Presidents: John F. Kennedy, 1963*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 111.

get a rule, and if it did, would be emasculated on the floor of the House or in conference."⁴

He concluded with a hope that attempts at legislation that year would not become bogged down in a church-state controversy as it had in the two previous years:

"Finally, it is my prayer that the knotty problem of church and state in the field of education shall be brought to a definite conclusion once and for all. If we fail to pass education in this session of this Congress, then it is my firm belief that, after these many years of laboring and having brought forth nothing, education for our generation as far as Federal assistance is concerned is finished. This will be a sorry day, for as I now return to my opening remarks, it will mean the definite decline of the West in general and the United States in particular, and the turning over of the leadership of first-class education to the forces who would use it not to free men's minds but to enslave them."⁵

Administration Spokesmen Testify

The first witness was the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, former mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, who succeeded Abraham Ribicoff. Ribicoff had become U.S. Senator from Connecticut. As an administration spokesman, Secretary Celebrezze naturally supported the omnibus approach to Federal assistance to education as embodied in H.R. 3000. He contended that no single part of the educational system could be properly assessed by itself alone.⁶

The Republican members of the Committee were much against the omnibus approach and favored selection of priority areas of education and concentration of effort on them. Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., Republican of New Jersey and ranking minority member of the Committee, in responding to Secretary Celebrezze's strong recommendation for an omnibus approach, expressed a viewpoint held by minority members of the Committee:

"One of the reasons why some of us are concerned about your insistence—and I assume you are insisting on it—on a comprehensive cradle-to-the-grave education bill, is that the dose is not going to kill the patient. Some of us are getting mighty impatient about the lack of any constructive action by Congress. I can only urge that we do not insist on an omnibus approach, because, in my opinion, the chairman is quite right in saying it probably couldn't even get out of committee and if it did, it would be lacerated, or again as the chairman said, emasculated on the floor. In such a case we would again have nothing to chalk up in the way of accomplishment."⁷

Republican members of the Committee attempted unsuccessfully to get Secretary Celebrezze to identify priority

areas of education. It was clear from the hearings, however, that a number of the members of the Committee, Democratic and Republican, were inclined toward favoring support of higher education while others were inclined toward favoring elementary and secondary education.

The Secretary urged increased support of graduate students:

"The high cost of obtaining a graduate education is the primary cause of attrition from study for advanced degrees. Of the total number of graduate students currently enrolled, only about 40 percent are full-time students. The others are part-time students because of the need to earn money to support themselves and their families.

"The long years before part-time students can earn doctorates aggravate this problem. Only in the natural science fields, where fellowships and assistantships are relatively abundant, can students earn their doctorates in 4 or 5 years. In the social sciences and the humanities, the average time required is over 8 years. It is essential that we increase fellowship aid so as to attract additional thousands of graduate students and in order to minimize the attrition rate of those graduate students already enrolled."⁸

Francis Keppel, Commissioner-Designate of Education, testified before the Committee. He had come to Washington from the position of Dean of Education at Harvard University to replace Sterling M. McMurrin, who had returned to the University of Utah in the fall of 1962. Mr. Keppel called the attention of the Committee to the tidal wave of students moving toward college classrooms, requiring at least 406,000 new teachers and administrative personnel over a 10-year period. He said that the Nation's objective should be about 100 doctorates annually per million population. This meant that to serve 190 million population with one institution for each 2,500,000, some 75 substantial graduate schools would be needed. "There is no lack of will to expand," he said, "only a lack of funds."⁹ Mr. Keppel also stated that from the point of view of the Nation's strength, the humanities and the fine arts were just as deserving of Federal fellowships as were the physical sciences.¹⁰

Views of the American Council on Education

The views of the American Council on Education, representing 1,000 member institutions of higher education and 175 member organizations, were presented by three witnesses—Charles E. Odegaard, President of the University of Washington; Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., President, University of Connecticut; and Allan M. Cartter, Vice President, American Council on Education. The Council proposed that graduate fellowships be increased from 1,500 to 5,000 and distributed in these categories:

1. Up to 2,000 in existing "new and expanded" category.
2. Up to 2,000 in programs of graduate instruction in

⁴ *National Education Improvement Act*. Hearings Before the Committee on Education and Labor. House. 88th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. p. 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

institutions which make a major contribution toward meeting the pressing need for college teachers.

3. Up to 1,000 1-year awards for college teachers who are within a year of completing the requirements for the doctorate.¹¹

In addition, the Council recommended a flat grant of \$3,000 a year to an institution for each NDEA fellow enrolled, with the stipulation that the institution waive all tuition and other fees—other than for room and board—normally required of graduate students.

Dr. Babbidge said that "most people in higher education feel that we would be a lot better off if we had a more equitable distribution of fellowships among the disciplines."¹² He pointed to the large number of fellowships awarded in the sciences as a consequence of categorical programs in other agencies. "I hesitate," he continued, "to use the word 'imbalance' because that represents a judgment, but from the point of view of an academic institution, it would be desirable to have the number, size, and amount of fellowships available in the humanities and the social sciences increased to bring about a more generally uniform distribution of opportunities."

Dr. Cartter stated that the additional NDEA fellowships requested in H.R. 3000 was still only a fraction of the needed fellowships from all sources and that he favored 5,000 new fellowships as an adequate goal for 1963-64 but hoped that the Committee would recommend raising the limit to 10,000 in one or two steps over the succeeding years.

He urged approval of the provisions for summer fellowships as a major factor in substantially reducing the elapsed time for completion of doctoral study. "If any change is made in the proposed figure of 2,000 summer fellowships," he said, "I personally hope it will be an upward revision."¹³

Dr. Cartter argued that graduate education was partly a national responsibility. At the undergraduate level, he said, about 75 percent of students were from within their own State. At the graduate level the number dropped to 50 percent or less, and in the case of doctoral students alone, the number dwindled to almost 20 percent. "So it is more and more difficult," he said, "the higher up the academic ladder you go, to justify fully supporting the institution from its own public revenues."¹⁴

Rexford G. Moon, Jr., Director of the College Scholarship Service, an activity of the College Entrance Examination Board—a nonprofit organization with a membership of 504 colleges and universities, 41 educational associations, and 165 secondary schools—presented the startling data to the Committee that within 2 years, 42 percent more youngsters would try to enter college than had tried to enter in the fall of 1962.¹⁵ Although Mr. Moon's interest was primarily at the undergraduate level, he did present some data on graduate student support:

"About 100,000 of the 134,159 graduate awards estimated for all purposes in 1960-61 were restricted to science (National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, Atomic Energy Commission, Mental Rehabilitation agencies, Bureau of Standards). This is 75 percent of the total. How many unrestricted awards (i.e., Veterans Administration programs, NDEA loans, etc.) were also used in science study is not known, but it is probably high, adding further numbers to the already heavy concentration of Federal student support in the sciences."¹⁶

Hearings on S. 580

Hearings on S. 580 opened on April 29, 1963, before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, with Senator Morse presiding. The hearings continued for a total of 16 additional days, ending on June 27. The record of the hearings consisted of 4,429 pages of testimony, inserts, and appendixes, published in seven volumes. A great many Members of Congress, both Senators and Representatives, testified before the subcommittee.

As he opened the hearings, Senator Morse took cognizance of the question that had been raised regarding the omnibus approach to education legislation as embodied in the administration's recommendations:

"Speaking now only for myself as a member of the subcommittee, I observe that there has been much speculation in the press about whether there should be an omnibus bill or whether there should be a number of separate bills acted upon. The senior Senator from Oregon is for President Kennedy's education program. In some areas he would like to see even more done than has been recommended. He is not particularly impressed with the logic which holds that three separate purchases of items with a total fixed cost is more economical than one purchase of all three items with the same price tag."¹⁷

On the second day of the hearings, two of the Nation's leading scientists—Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's Science Adviser, and Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission—urged, as representatives of the Executive Branch of Government, across-the-board Federal support of education; but they particularly emphasized the need for aid to graduate education. They endorsed the expansion of NDEA fellowships to 10,000 new ones annually, but both took pains to make it clear that the humanities and the social sciences should not be neglected in such expansion. "We must also view the education picture as a whole to maintain a balance among the parts," said Dr. Wiesner. "It is vital, for example, to maintain a balance between science and technology, on the one hand, and literature, history, art, music, and social sciences, on the other hand."¹⁸ Dr. Seaborg cautioned that

¹¹ Ibid., p. 483.

¹⁷ *Education Legislation—1963*. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Senate. 88th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963. p. 3.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 399.

¹¹ Ibid., p. 267.

¹² Ibid., p. 500.

¹³ Ibid., p. 475.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 511.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 479.

it was "important that these other fields (the humanities and the social sciences) not be slighted and discounted in today's rush toward science."¹⁹

Views of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the State Universities Association

The views of the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the State Universities Association were presented by Mason W. Gross, President of Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.²⁰ The two organizations had a combined membership of 97 major universities and colleges located in all States and Puerto Rico, all of which, except two, were public institutions. The combined enrollment of these institutions in the fall of 1962 represented 28 percent of the enrollment in all U.S. colleges and universities and at the graduate level these institutions granted more than 55 percent of all doctoral degrees.

While recognizing the value of the extension by the 87th Congress of the original title IV program as a stopgap measure, the two organizations urged congressional action along these lines:

(1) provisions of at least an equivalent number of new fellowships to be awarded through graduate schools which have underutilized capacity;

(2) continuance and modest expansion of the existing program offering fellowships through institutions willing to undertake new and expanded graduate programs;

(3) additional fellowships with sufficient flexibility so as to meet the needs of young faculty members who need to take full-time leave to complete their doctoral programs;

(4) provision for fixed per-student payment to graduate schools rather than the existing policy of reimbursement on the basis of detailed costs, which involves excessive administrative details; and

(5) provisions for replacement of fellowship holders when they were forced to drop out of the program.

The two associations did not specify the number of fellowships to which they wished to see the program expanded, but they were strongly opposed to expansion of the fellowship program along lines which would increase the tendencies of several existing programs to further concentration of fellowship holders in a very few institutions. They commended the National Science Foundation for recognizing the problem of concentration, which it in part had created, by awarding a portion of its fellowships through institutions. They also commended the Office of Education for the administration of the NDEA fellowship program:

"We commend the U.S. Office of Education for its wisdom in administering the fellowship program so as to recognize the great contributions of the humanities and social sciences toward strengthening our national life. Un-

fortunately the financial support of the humanities and social sciences available through the graduate program of the U.S. Office of Education is inadequate to correct the great imbalance which exists in their support as compared to that of the natural sciences and additional measures are called for to meet this situation. Legislation introduced by Representative Fogarty of Rhode Island in the last session of Congress, to provide for the establishment of a humanities foundation, could well furnish a basis for the kind of action needed."²¹

Dr. Gross received permission to insert in the record of the hearings a letter written on May 6, 1963, by Henry E. Bent, Dean of the University of Missouri Graduate School, to Representative George P. Miller, Chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee.²² In January of that year, Miller's Committee had heard testimony from a witness that there was no longer any great need to expand fellowship programs. The purpose of Dean Bent's letter was to refute this testimony. He cited the situation at his own university, which he regarded as a rather typical institution—neither the largest nor the smallest, the most prestigious nor the least.

Dean Bent said that his university had available in the fall of 1962 ten fellowships of \$1,000 each which were financed by a donation to the university. There were about 120 applicants for these fellowships, of whom 80 were considered fully qualified to receive them. They had all been recommended highly by their previous teachers; all had grades of "B" or better in their undergraduate programs and many of them had mostly "A" grades. Their letters of recommendation usually had a comment to the effect that the students were in the top 5 or 10 percent of their class. Dean Bent wrote that this experience at the University of Missouri in regard to fellowships could perhaps be multiplied by a factor of 100 to give the picture for the country as a whole.

Commissioner Keppel Testifies

Contrary to the usual procedure, Commissioner Keppel and his staff were called to testify near the close of the Senate subcommittee hearings rather than at the beginning of them. Senator Morse stated that he had done this deliberately in order that the Commissioner's testimony would contain comments upon points raised by other witnesses, as well as any additional material as he desired to present.

Commissioner Keppel referred to the decline in the percentage of new college teachers holding the doctorate from 31.4 percent in 1954 to 25.4 percent in 1962 according to National Education Association research studies. Senator Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia, wanted to know the reasons for this decline. Mr. Keppel said that there were two reasons: (1) the substantial growth of higher education during the preceding decade; and (2) the fact that less than half of those obtaining the Ph. D.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 419.

²⁰ The State Universities Association was absorbed in 1964 by the Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the name of the resulting organization was changed in 1965 to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

²¹ Ibid., p. 593.

²² Ibid., pp. 588-89.

were entering the academic world but were instead going into industry and government, and into the sciences, in particular. He stated that dramatic increase in the number of fellowships was urgently needed.²³

At the end of the hearings, Senator Morse stated that members of the subcommittee had indicated that they might wish to submit questions to the Commissioner of Education. "In the event this occurs," he said, "we would like written answers and I shall hold the record open long enough for you to provide them."

On July 10, 1963, Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican of Vermont, presented a number of questions to the Office of Education. The questions, together with the responses of Commissioner Keppel, were printed in the record of the hearings. One of the questions concerned the wisdom of S. 580's provision increasing the number of fellowships, beginning in fiscal 1964, from 1,500 to 10,000. This large and sudden increase was questioned because of the testimony of Allan Cartter of the American Council on Education to the effect that an increase of this magnitude should be graduated over a period of years.

Mrs. Green Introduces H.R. 6061

When it became apparent, as had been predicted, that the omnibus approach as embodied by H.R. 3000 would fail, the House Committee on Education and Labor, which had been holding hearings as a Whole Committee during February of 1963, broke up into three subcommittees to which were assigned various aspects of H.R. 3000. Edith Green's Special Subcommittee on Education assumed responsibility for the portion pertaining to amendments to NDEA.

On May 6, 1963, Mrs. Green introduced a bill which, if enacted, was to be cited as the National Defense Education Act Amendments of 1963. She said that she introduced the bill as "a working paper" to serve as a basis for the hearing witnesses.²⁴

The bill contained seven titles which, except for minor changes in several of them, were taken intact from H.R. 3000. For one thing, the title in the Green bill pertaining to graduate fellowships was different from that in the corresponding part of H.R. 3000. It also permitted the Commissioner of Education to set the stipends (including allowances for dependents), from time to time pursuant to regulations and to pay to an institution of higher education for each fellow such amount (less any tuition and fees paid by the fellow) as he determined and specified in regulations after considering the average cost of educating various categories of such fellows at institutions of higher education.

Hearings on the Green bill took place during 3 days in May and 2 days in June of 1963. Commissioner Keppel, who had testified in February on H.R. 3000, was the first

witness to testify on H.R. 6061. Again the Commissioner, who said that he was still favoring the omnibus bill approach, urged expansion of the graduate fellowship program to 10,000 new fellowships annually, plus 2,000 special fellowships. When he also urged Federal aid for the development of graduate centers of study and research as proposed by part E of title II of H.R. 3000, he was informed by Mrs. Green that the provision for graduate centers was part of a higher education bill on facilities which had just been approved by her subcommittee.²⁵

Another witness who testified on graduate fellowships was Leonard B. Beach, Dean of the Graduate School of Vanderbilt University and past president of the Association of Graduate Schools and of the Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools. Dean Beach also had served for a number of years on the Title IV Advisory Committee, serving both as chairman and member of the humanities panel. "Everywhere I go," he said, "I find the ferment and excitement of the National Defense Education Act. In my opinion the National Defense Education Act represents the opening door to massive and balanced enlargement of graduate facilities in every State under the best possible conditions."²⁶

Dean Beach illustrated the impact of title IV on his own university, a private institution of 4,200 students in all schools, including professional schools. The total graduate school population was a little over 800, with 500 of them active candidates for degrees. Of the 500—100—or 20 percent, were NDEA fellows. Another 20 percent were supported by other Federal sources. He estimated that 75 percent of the graduate students were receiving financial help.

With NDEA and other support, Dean Beach said, in 5 years time the number of departments offering the Ph. D. had doubled from 12 to 24. Whereas the number of Ph. D.'s over the preceding decade had averaged fewer than 40 a year, Vanderbilt was expecting shortly to double or triple that number.

Dean Beach, a scholar in the field of English, made a plea for more support for the humanities and the social sciences. He even advocated the inclusion of a stipulation that a definite percentage of the fellowship awards be made to the humanities and the social sciences.

The hearings were adjourned on June 17, 1963, and no further hearings were held that year. Discussion of the resumed hearings, which began on February 3, 1964, and the act which resulted from them, is contained in chapter VIII.

No Bills on NDEA Amendments Reported Out Despite Hearings

Despite the lengthy hearings on H.R. 3000, H.R. 6061,

²³ Ibid., p. 2519.

²⁴ *To Amend and Extend the National Defense Education Act*. Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor. House. 88th Congress, 1st and 2d Sessions. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 7.

²⁵ This bill, titled "Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963," was enacted into Public Law 88-204 on December 16, 1963. This law provided for academic facilities at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

²⁶ *To Amend and Extend the National Defense Education Act*, op. cit., p. 105.

and S. 580, no bills amending NDEA were reported out of Committee in either the House or the Senate until the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare added on NDEA amendments to H.R. 4955, the vocational education bill, on October 1, 1963. Since H.R. 4955 encountered many delays and was not passed and finally approved until December 18, 1963, the account of the legislative history of H.R. 4955 is described in the narrative of the sixth year of title IV operation (chapter VIII).

Appropriations for 1963-64

On February 18, 1963, Secretary Celebrezze presented to the House Subcommittee on Appropriations the Department's request for fiscal 1964 appropriations. He requested \$229,600,000 for Defense Educational Activities, an increase of \$170,000 over the fiscal 1963 appropriations. Of the \$229,600,000, \$21,200,000 was for graduate fellowships, same as the previous year.

Although the appropriations bill, as passed, cut out \$10,000,000 from the \$229,600,000 requested for Defense Educational Activities, the full \$21,200,000 asked for title IV fellowships was approved. This was the same amount approved the preceding year. The appropriations bill, H.R. 5888, was signed into law (Public Law 88-136) on October 11, 1963. As in the previous year, the law continued to have the provision that no part of the appropriation could be used for graduate fellowships which were not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purpose of the National Defense Education Act as stated in section 101 thereof.

Gustave Arlt Discusses NDEA Title IV at Midwest Conference

The 19th Annual Meeting of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research was held in Chicago on March 18 and 19, 1963. Gustave O. Arlt, President of the Council of Graduate Schools of the United States, reported on the questionnaire sent in May 1962 to the 102 students of the original 1,000 who were expecting to earn the doctorate within 3 years of the time they commenced their fellowships in the fall of 1959.²⁷ He reviewed some of the findings of the survey pertaining to: preparation for graduate work; language requirements; program requirements; summer activities of fellows; the current employment status of fellows.

In his concluding remarks, Dr. Arlt declared that the questionnaire survey had indicated to him that three amendments to title IV were highly desirable. First, he urged that title IV be amended to permit replacements

for vacated fellowships. He said that of 1,000 fellows who had started with 3-year fellowships in the fall of 1959 and 96 fellows who had been awarded 2-year fellowships starting in the fall of 1960, 341 had resigned early in the program. He felt that an amendment providing for replacement of resigned fellows was of even higher priority than an increase in the total number of fellowships.

Second, he recommended that stipends for fellows be increased to provide 12 months per year of support instead of 9. Findings of the questionnaire survey, he said, "demonstrated that under ideal—or nearly ideal—conditions the doctorate can be attained in 3 *calendar* years." He said it was quite unrealistic to believe that it could be done in 3 *academic* years. He pointed out that the National Science Foundation had found that its summer fellowship program had become one of its popular ones. "If speedy completion of the doctorate becomes increasingly important," he said, "fellowship support on a twelve months basis is essential."

Third, he urged provisions for a small number of fourth-year fellowships. He noted that of 755 students who had completed 3 years of fellowship tenure, only 102 had earned the doctorate in 3 years, leaving 653 who had not. He suggested that the "fourth year fellowships be awarded in rare cases upon recommendation of the student's doctoral committee and a virtual guarantee that, in the committee's opinion, he will be able to finish within a year. This is not throwing good money after bad but rather using a trifling sum to save a very much larger investment."

Dr. Arlt concluded his speech to the Conference by describing as very gratifying the fact that 73 of the 89 doctoral recipients responding to the question of employment had reported that they had obtained employment in academic careers. The 73 included not only all those in the humanities and social sciences (45) who are normally expected to go into teaching but more than half of those in the natural sciences (28 out of 51).

Other 1962-63 Activities

On May 1, Dean Walters sent to all title IV coordinators forms and instructions to be used in preparing program applications for the academic year 1964-65, with the request that they be completed and returned to the Office of Education by October 15, 1963. Coordinators were requested to insure that (1) only one program was submitted by any one department; (2) that each proposed program title indicated a broad subject-matter area such as English or entomology rather than specialized fields such as Contemporary English and American Literature or Behavioral Physiology of Insects; and (3) that priority was given to programs in the basic academic disciplines of undergraduate instruction and fields directly related to defense needs. They were informed that if a program had received fellowships for 4 years, the applicant would need to produce a strong case in order to be awarded additional fellowships.

²⁷ Gustave O. Arlt. "The NDEA Fellowship Program," *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research*, March 18 and 19, 1963. Iowa City, Iowa: The Midwest Graduate Study and Research Foundation, Inc. pp. 59-71.

CHAPTER VIII

sixth year of operation

Alan D. Ferguson, a regional representative of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, and a former Assistant Graduate Dean of Yale University, became in July 1963 the sixth director of the NDEA graduate fellowship program. One of his first actions was to send to all title IV coordinators a reminder that applications for title IV fellowships had to be filed by October 15, 1963. He emphasized that study program proposals should be broad, i.e., departmental or interdepartmental, rather than "sub-departmental." "Our objective, in keeping with the intentions of Congress in Title IV," he said, "is to help in the expansion of basic graduate training facilities. The basis for a proposal should be the development of a new or expanded discipline program, not a fragment of such a program."

The October 1963 Competition for 1964-65 Fellowships

Guidelines for Panel Members

As in the immediately preceding years, the competition for fellowships to commence in the fall of 1964 was held

late in October and, as before, the Title IV Advisory Committee was assisted in the evaluation of applications by consultants. In making an overall rating of a program proposal, each reviewer was asked to keep in mind the following considerations:

1. The need for college teachers in the field of study.
2. The need for further graduate training facilities in the geographical region of the sponsoring institution.
3. The value of the particular program to the institution, as reflected in the "Institutional Ranking" on the application.
4. The availability of financial support for the field of study and/or proposed program from other Federal sources.

The reviewers were also urged to take care that qualitative standards were held rigorous. Dr. Ferguson said that several programs approved in the past had not fulfilled commitments and several had had serious loss of students. He admitted that this was a difficult problem, but he emphasized that title IV objectives were not furthered by encouraging students to undertake study in weak programs.

The panel members were told that such professional

fields as library science, medical technology, city planning, nursing, and speech pathology could not be supported unless it could be clearly demonstrated that the subject matter of such fields was commonly taught in the undergraduate curriculums in the Nation's colleges. In any event, such programs were to receive low priority.

A proposal for an interinstitutional "cooperative" program had to demonstrate that the faculties and facilities of all participating institutions had joined to provide a doctoral program which no one of them separately could provide. Title IV could not, under the existing regulations, support a proposal of which the primary objective was the strengthening of the master's degree program at any one of the participating institutions.

Where a major university had outlying campuses, it was a policy to support title IV programs at such a campus "only if there was a modicum of independent academic and administrative control." The establishment of a curriculum by the parent unit or the administration of a program by common department chairmen served as indications of a *dependent* campus. In any case, the only programs which were to be approved were those which were self-contained in the sense that a fellow could achieve the doctorate by completion of the proposed study program.

Panel members were also told that the expansion of a doctoral study program by the addition of a course or several courses did not in itself warrant a program's being approved, although it was one legal justification for submitting an application. They were urged in their deliberations to be concerned with the totality of a doctoral study program rather than with just particular aspects of it.

A problem that had been coming up at this time in regard to title IV programs was, as mentioned before, the question of continuing support of previously approved programs. The following policy was determined and given to the panel members before they began their program evaluations:

"Approval of a proposal, either for initial or continuing support, need no longer be for a single year at a time, but . . . can be for such a reasonable number of years as may be determined to be essential to serve equitably the major purpose of the proposal. A commitment of awards for two or more years beyond the next academic year can be made to any given study program on the conditions that the Commissioner of Education annually finds satisfactory progress toward program objectives being made, and that the Congress annually appropriates funds for continued support of Title IV. . . . Preference shall be given, in the making of such commitments beyond a single year, to study programs in fields in which college teacher shortages are most acute."

Competition Results

A total of 1,234 applications requesting 6,197 fellowships from 179 institutions was received by the October 15 deadline. Approved were 690 applications to which were allocated the 1,500 authorized fellowships in 156 institutions

of higher education. Applications were received from every State of the Union and the District of Columbia, and only one State failed to receive new fellowship awards. Fifty-eight percent of the available fellowships went to the humanities, social sciences, and education group and 42 percent to the science and engineering group. When the recommendations of the Title IV Advisory Committee were submitted to Commissioner Keppel, he disapproved the recommended program in classical studies sponsored jointly by the State University of Iowa (now the University of Iowa), the University of Minnesota, and the University of Wisconsin, because, in his opinion, it "did not fit the congressional intent."

When informing institutions of the programs approved for title IV support, Dr. Ferguson explained that in some cases the number of fellowships allocated was below the minimum requested because of the large volume of requests. He asked the title IV coordinators to communicate with him at once if any given allocation of this type precluded the full development of the program. He also mentioned, in line with the interest of the Office of Education in broadening the base of support, certain approved programs had been listed by their generic rather than their specific titles.

Change of Award Procedure

On November 14, 1963, Dr. Ferguson sent to all title IV coordinators a memorandum announcing certain changes in the procedure for the award of fellowships. Under the former procedure the Office of Education sometimes received nominations of the same candidate from several institutions; it then asked the fellow to choose from among the nominating institutions; and, finally, it notified the institutions not chosen by the fellow that they should name alternates. Under the new procedure the institution would have the responsibility of drawing up a final list of nominees, all of whom had agreed to accept nominations. The Office of Education would normally not communicate with the nominee until it forwarded to him or her a certificate of award through the title IV coordinator.

The specific changes were outlined in the memorandum as follows:

"Following receipt of an allocation of Title IV awards, an institution will be free to undertake negotiations with fellowship candidates to determine their willingness to accept an award.

"After an institution has notified a candidate that it is prepared to nominate him or her for an award, the candidate must either accept or decline this offer of nomination by April 15. (This is in accordance with procedures agreed to by members of the Council of Graduate Schools of the United States.)

"Participating institutions will submit to the U.S. Office of Education, *after April 15 and before May 8*, the names of those students who have indicated that they are prepared to accept the award.

"When a nominee has indicated he or she would ac-

cept an award, the institution will instruct the nominee to submit to the Office of Education the forms and papers necessary for the award.

"Since nominees cannot reasonably be asked to commit themselves to accept awards until they have received assurances the awards will be offered to them, participating institutions are authorized to advise nominees that the Commissioner of Education will, except under extraordinary circumstances, make the award recommended by the institution.

"After the award has been made, the Office of Education will forward to the appropriate Title IV Coordinator an Official Certificate of Award for delivery to the nominee."

One-Year Extension of NDEA Approved in December 1963

As mentioned in the last chapter, in early 1963 the administration had been vigorously supporting an omnibus bill of Federal aid to education, including extension and substantial amendment to NDEA. When it became clear that this omnibus approach was doomed to failure, H.R. 3000 was broken up into parts, resulting in the introduction of several new bills which were vying for consideration. This created a legislative logjam in regard to education bills and accounts for the main reason that a bill amending NDEA did not get reported out of Edith Green's House Subcommittee on Education after she adjourned the hearings on June 17, 1963. For one thing, Mrs. Green's bill, H.R. 6143, "The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963," had been reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee on May 27, 1963. This bill, considered as priority legislation, was in the "legislative mill" and was not passed by the Congress and approved by the President until December 16, 1963.

Another reason that a bill did not emerge from Mrs. Green's Special Subcommittee at that time was the priority that had been given by President Kennedy to the need for vocational education. On June 19, 1963, the President sent a "Special Message to Congress on Civil Rights and Job Opportunities" in which he warned of a "rising tide of discontent that threatens the public safety in many parts of the country."¹ As one of the means of reducing Negro unemployment, he urged more education and training to raise the level of skills. He recommended two additions to the vocational education amendment that he had proposed in his January 29 message to Congress on education, and he urged that congressional action be taken promptly.

H.R. 4955, a bill to strengthen the quality of vocational education opportunities in the Nation, was introduced in the House by Representative Carl D. Perkins, Democrat of Kentucky, who chaired the Subcommittee on General Education which had been holding hearings on title V-A of H.R. 3000 relating to vocational education. H.R. 4955 was reported to the House with amendments on June 6, 1963,

and on August 6, 1963, passed the House as reported, by a vote of 377 to 21, whereupon it was referred to the Senate. It took until October 1, 1963, before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported out a bill which struck out the text of the bill as it passed the House and substituted in lieu thereof three parts:

Part A—a vocational education part incorporating the expanded vocational education recommendations of the President.

Part B—a 3-year extension and amendment of NDEA.

Part C—the extension and amendment of Public Law 815 and 874.

In regard to the Graduate Fellowship Program, the Senate amendments to H.R. 4955 contained two much sought-after technical amendments to the title IV program. One of these permitted reaward of vacated fellowships for the unused portions of the award and the other provided for a uniform subvention of \$2,500 per academic year for each fellow, less any tuition or fee charged him.

When H.R. 4955 was taken up on the Senate floor on October 7, 1963, Senator Morse, floor manager for the measure, made a strong plea for the 3-year extension of NDEA as provided for in the bill. He said:

"NDEA authority will expire on June 30, 1964, some nine months from now. By extending the act at this time, we can help all of these educators take the steps which will result in decisions designed to stretch to the utmost for educational uses every dollar they receive.

"I cannot stress too much the importance of the three-year extension proposal in this bill from the standpoint of economizing on the educational dollar in college after college and school after school. It is wasteful not to give these college and school administrators the leadtime they need for making a wise expenditure of the money that is to be made available to them under the various titles of the National Defense Education Act program. If we wait until the 11th hour, we shall confront them with a situation in which they will be unable to make the sound judgments to which I have just alluded."²

On October 8 the Senate passed, with amendments, H.R. 4955 and requested a conference with the House to iron out their differences. The House did not get a rule until October 24, thus permitting H.R. 4955 to be taken up from the Speaker's table and sent to conference. The vote to agree to a conference did not come until October 29. There seemed to be ruffled feelings on the part of some members of the House on the "cavalier treatment" given by the Senate to the House-passed version of H.R. 4955. These feelings were exemplified in a statement by Representative Clarence J. Brown, Republican of Ohio:

"The bill, H.R. 4955, as it passed the House, dealt only with vocational education. When it reached the other body, the bill was amended drastically and very, very broadly. The first 25 pages, which seemed to have been all of the House measure, were stricken from H.R. 4955 after it reached the cloisters on the other side of the Capitol,

¹ *Public Papers of the Presidents: John F. Kennedy 1963*, op. cit., p. 483.

² *Congressional Record*. Vol. 109, Part 14, October 7, 1963 p. 18796.

and some 45 pages of new legislation were introduced as amendments to the bill."³

Another reason for the slowness of the House to agree to a conference on H.R. 4955 was that the House had been planning its own legislation to extend NDEA and the impacted schools assistance acts for 1 year rather than for the 3 years as provided in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4955. In fact, according to Mr. Brown, some of the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor who would serve as representatives of the House on the conference committee, appeared before the Rules Committee and "pledged . . . that they intended to support to the bitter end, the provisions of the House bill, especially as it pertained to the impacted school district amendment and to the Defense Education Act amendment."⁴

The reason the House members were so insistent on a 1-year extension of NDEA was that Edith Green's Special Subcommittee on Education was Planning to resume hearings on NDEA amendments at the beginning of the next year, and they didn't want to be stymied by a 3-year extension which would make it much more difficult to get any new legislation passed that year.

The conference between the House and Senate conferees did not proceed smoothly. In a briefing to the Senate on December 6, Senator Morse reported little progress had been made. The assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963, had brought a halt to the hearings for 3 weeks. House and Senate conferees were in severe disagreement over some portions of the bill (not the NDEA portions, however). Finally, they did come to agreement, and a conference report giving the details of this agreement was printed on December 10. The Senate conferees agreed to a 1-year extension of NDEA as demanded by the House conferees.

When the conference report was taken up in the House, on December 12, Representative Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., bitterly assailed the conference report. He asserted that "the House conferees compromised at every turn and with respect to every section of the bill." He said that, as a result of the Senate amendments and compromises by the House conferees, "millions of dollars have been added to already generous authorizations." The conference report was so bad, he said, that the House Republican conferees were unable to sign it and their Democratic colleagues did so "with great reluctance."⁵ He moved to recommit the report to conference, a motion which was defeated by a record vote of 180 yeas and 192 nays, with 61 not voting. Then immediately following, the House adopted the conference report by a record vote of 301 to 65.

The Senate considered and after little discussion agreed to the conference report by a vote of 82 to 4, with 14 not voting, thus sending the measure to the President. President Lyndon B. Johnson signed H.R. 4955 into Public

Law 88-210 on December 18, 1963. Following is the language of the law as it pertained to title IV of NDEA:

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV— NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 24. (a) Section 402 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "five succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "six succeeding fiscal years."

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 402," and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) In addition to the number of fellowships, authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine."

(c) Subsection (b) of section 404 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each person is pursuing his course of study \$2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition."

Deadline for Title IV Applications Advanced to June 1

On February 21, 1964, Dr. Ferguson sent to all title IV coordinators and graduate deans the important announcement that the deadline for the submission of title IV applications for the academic year 1965-66 had been advanced from October, as had been the practice in the preceding years, to June 1, 1964. He explained that the reasons for this change were related to the desires and needs of participating institutions and students. The Office of Education, he said, now planned to notify all applicants of the allocation of NDEA fellowships no later than September 1 each year and to publish no later than October 15 each year the list for distribution to all colleges and universities. This meant that institutions would know a calendar year in advance the fellowships available to them. It also meant that college seniors, most importantly, as well as other students, would know very early where the awards would be available. Dr. Ferguson said that he expected both factors would result in greater ease and efficiency in planning and recruiting. He also announced that the new application forms and instructions would be distributed from his office on or about April 1, 1964.

1963 Title IV Amendments Announced

On the same day that he mailed announcements of the new application deadline, Dr. Ferguson sent a memorandum to title IV coordinators and graduate deans telling them about the two amendments to title IV passed by Congress and approved by President Johnson in December of 1963. He explained that the amendment which authorized the payment of a uniform institutional allowance of \$2,500 per academic year for each attending fellow, less a mandatory deduction of any amount charged the fellow for tui-

³ *Congressional Record* Vol. 109, Part 15, October 29, 1963, p. 20417.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 20418.

⁵ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 19, Part 18, December 12, 1963, p. 24279.

tion, would not be effective until the 1964-65 academic year. He said that the policies by which institutions could receive up to \$2,500 per fellow for costs of education, and which required an accounting for such costs, would remain in effect during the current year, 1963-64.

The second amendment authorized the Commissioner of Education to reaward the unused portions of vacated fellowships. Dr. Ferguson emphasized that the law authorized, but did not specifically require, the Commissioner to reaward such fellowships. He pointed out that the complete activation of this amendment was not possible at that time, since the full amount of money needed to cover the student stipends and institutional cost-of-education payments was not available. Supplemental funds were therefore necessary before vacated fellowships could be reawarded for use during the academic year 1964-65. A request had been made of Congress for such an appropriation.

The memorandum stated that the Office of Education was proceeding on the assumption that, when funds were available to make this amendment effective, vacated fellowships would be allocated to the institutions and programs to which they were originally assigned. Nevertheless, the Commissioner would retain the prerogative of making this decision. Dr. Ferguson promised that as soon as the decision in this matter was clear he would notify each school of the number of vacated fellowships for which it might nominate candidates. He said that the procedures of nomination and award would be the same as for original fellowships.

Dr. Ferguson also informed institutions that it seemed probable that only full-year increments, i.e., 3 years, 2 years, 1 year, would be authorized as valid tenure time for these vacated fellowships. A fellowship with 2 years of tenure remaining might be awarded either to a first-year or a second-year graduate student; a fellowship with only 1 year of tenure remaining might be awarded either to a first-year, second-year, or third-year graduate student. No fractional parts of an academic year unused by the original awardee could be used by the new awardee.

Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of March 16, 1964

The Title IV Advisory Committee met with administrators of predoctoral assistance programs from the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health and reviewed standards, policies, and procedures in those programs.

The Committee reviewed with Assistant Commissioner of Education Peter Muirhead the proposed legislation (H.R. 9846) relating to title IV. It recommended that (1) title IV awards be freed of the present restriction limiting them to the support of only the first, second, or third post-baccalaureate years of graduate study, and that (2) some title IV fellowships be extended to a fourth year of support to students who needed that additional time to complete their doctorates. The Committee also agreed that

the proposed schedule of increase in number of awards was excellent.

The Committee recommended that title IV awards continue to be allocated chiefly in the humanities, social sciences, and education disciplines. It also recommended that these awards be widely distributed rather than clustered at certain schools in certain geographical areas.

Mary I. Bunting, President of Radcliffe College, made a strong recommendation that some title IV awards be made to women who could attend graduate school only on a part-time basis. She stated that many women could not undertake advanced study on the same time basis as men because of the demands of their domestic duties.

House Special Subcommittee on Education Resumes Hearings

With a 1-year extension of NDEA having been approved on December 18, 1963, Mrs. Green's Special Subcommittee on Education on February 3, 1964, resumed the hearings on NDEA amendments which had been adjourned since June 17, 1963. Since, in addition to extending NDEA for 1 year, Congress had also made several technical amendments to NDEA, including two to title IV, Mrs. Green introduced on February 1, 1964, a new, slightly modified bill, H.R. 9846, in place of her 1963 bill, H.R. 6061, to serve as a basis for continued discussion.

Because the Congress in 1963 had authorized the reaward of vacated fellowships, that provision of Mrs. Green's 1963 bill was deleted in her new one. In place of 10,000 fellowships for each of the 3 years as provided in H.R. 6061, H.R. 9846 authorized 5,000 fellows for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, 7,500 the next year, and 10,000 the third year. In her new bill, Mrs. Green also dropped the provision for 2,000 summer fellowships contained in her original bill, and in its place permitted a fellowship holder, who previously was limited to 3 regular academic years of study, to pursue studies during periods outside the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, and to receive for such periods of study additional payments for stipends and dependency allowances as the Commissioner of Education would determine to be appropriate. The total duration of fellowship tenure could not exceed 3 calendar years.

Hearings on H.R. 9846 were held on February 3, 5, and 7, and March 2, 3, and 4 of 1964. The principal witness at these hearings was Commissioner of Education Keppel who appeared before the subcommittee on the first 2 days of the hearings. Commissioner Keppel again made a strong plea for a very substantial expansion in the number of graduate fellowships. He said that, although 320,000 new college teachers and 86,000 new administrative personnel would be needed during the decade of the 1960's, only 141,000 doctoral degrees would be awarded during that decade and only 45,000 of the holders of these degrees would enter academic life. As an example of the college teacher shortage, he cited the field of mathematics in which about 300 Ph. D.'s were being awarded annually. More

than half of these doctoral recipients he said, were entering industrial research, leaving fewer than 150 available for teaching in about 2,100 accredited colleges and universities—a ratio of one-fourteenth Ph. D. per college.⁶

For the information of the subcommittee, Commissioner Keppel had prepared a table showing Federal support of graduate study by various levels and agencies. This table, reproduced in the record of the hearings as exhibit 7, "Federal Support of Graduate Study: Number of participants in Federal fellowships, traineeships and training grant programs, fiscal years 1963 and 1964," showed that in 1964 there were supported by the Federal Government 15,895 full-time fellowships, 2,801 part-time and summer fellowships, 3,199 postdoctoral and special fellowships, 2,086 long-term traineeships, 7,000 short-term traineeships, 31,163 long-term training grants, and 56,218 short-term training grants, plus an indeterminate number of research assistants.⁷ In spite of this very substantial support of graduate education, Commissioner Keppel asserted that "despite the variety of existing programs, the total output under all federally supported graduate programs is but a fraction of that required by our times."⁸

Mrs. Green was particularly interested in whether or not the NDEA graduate fellowship program was meeting its stated purpose of increasing the number of well-qualified college teachers. She wanted to know how many NDEA fellows had actually entered college teaching.

Commissioner Keppel cited a staff study that had been made of 101 fellows of the class of 1959–60 who had earned their doctorate in 3 years. He submitted evidence that 77 of the 101 had by February 1964 entered college and university employment, 63 of them in teaching. He agreed that this was only a small sample (about 10 percent) but he regarded the data as representative. He considered the earning of a doctorate in 3 years as the exception, pointing out that the achievement of a Ph. D., particularly in the humanities, usually resulted only after 4, 5, and 6 years of study.⁹

Mrs. Green was concerned about what she considered a high rate of attrition in the title IV program—284 resignations out of 1,000 fellows in 1959–60 and 356 out of 1,500 fellows in the 1960–61 class. Peter Muirhead, Assistant Commissioner and Director, Office of Program and Legislative Planning, who assisted Commissioner Keppel at the hearings, offered this explanation for the high attrition rate of 1959–60 class:

⁶ *To Amend and Extend the National Defense Education Act*. Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor. House. 88th Congress, 1st and 2d Sessions. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. pp. 319–20.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 321. The terms, "fellowships," "traineeships," and "training grants" have the following meanings: "Fellowships" are awards which are made by a Federal agency head (e.g., institutions nominate and the Commissioner of Education awards NDEA fellowships); "traineeships" are Federal awards which are made by the institution itself; and "training grants" are grants providing multiple kinds of support, including financial support of graduate students.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 320.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 328–32.

"I think, Mrs. Green, it is fair to indicate that the class of 1959, that is the first year under the National Defense Education Act, is not wholly typical of the program as it has matured. As you know, the initial appropriation for the program came in the waning weeks of the 1958–59 college year. The program then had to be mounted. I think it is a reasonable thing to assume that the quality of the fellows in the first year of the program possibly is not as high as the fellows in succeeding years, because of the speed with which the program had to be mounted and the fact that in many instances students planning graduate study had already made other plans by the time these awards were made."¹⁰

When Mrs. Green said that it appeared to her that about 45 percent of the fellows were not going into college teaching as was the purpose of title IV (about 25 percent were resigning and 20 percent were going into occupations other than college or university employment), Commissioner Keppel replied that 45 percent was not a true figure. Many of those who had "resigned" NDEA fellowships, he said, were not necessarily lost to higher education, but had dropped out of school temporarily, had changed their majors, or had even accepted other fellowships or forms of financial aid.

The matter of attrition so concerned Mrs. Green that she asked Commissioner Keppel what he thought about a possible amendment to the fellowship program requiring that, in order to be eligible for a fellowship, a person would have to agree in writing that upon completion of studies as a full-time student he would accept, for a period of 2 years, employment: (1) if offered, in an institution of higher education or in elementary or secondary school, or (2) if offered, with the classified civil service, or (3) if offered, in a position determined by the Commissioner to be in the national interest. Mrs. Green pointed out that such a requirement would be in line with the requirements in the military services at the academies. Commissioner Keppel replied that he did not favor such a requirement but preferred the existing method of encouraging young people, not requiring them, to enter college teaching as a career.

The only other witness at the 1964 subcommittee hearings who had something to say pertaining to title IV was W. Stull Holt, Executive Secretary of the American Historical Association. Mr. Holt pointed out that the 506 graduate fellowships awarded under title IV to history students during the academic years 1959–60 through 1964–65 represented 5.9 percent of the total number awarded during these years. Then he said:

"While the historical profession has mixed feelings about the effect of the National Defense Education Act on graduate instruction, within our discipline, we lament the fact that the number of National Defense Education Act graduate fellowships granted in history nowhere begins to approach the quantitative, to say nothing of the qualitative, importance of history in the colleges and universities of

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 332.

the Nation. History is one of our most popular undergraduate majors throughout the country and the percentage of graduate students in history is far higher than 5.9 percent. The American Historical Association would hope, then that H.R. 9846, as administered, would provide a more proportionate number of fellowships in history.¹¹

Senator Morse Resumes Hearings on College Student Aid Legislation

As mentioned in the narrative of the fifth year of title IV operation, Senator Morse's subcommittee had held hearings on S. 580, the omnibus bill on Federal aid to education, in April, May, and June of 1963 but no separate bill on NDEA amendments was reported out of committee that year. True, there were the 1-year extension and minor amendments to NDEA tacked on to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, but this was a stopgap measure. It was for this reason that the subcommittee, on February 20, 1964, resumed hearings on S. 580 and on a bill, S. 2490, introduced by Senator Vance Hartke, Democrat of Indiana, on February 3, 1964, to provide assistance for students in higher education by increasing the amount authorized for loans under NDEA and by establishing programs for scholarships, loan insurance, and work-study. Senator Hartke's bill contained no provisions for graduate fellowships and, since graduate fellowships had been thoroughly discussed in the hearings on S. 580 during the previous year, no discussion of title IV took place either on February 20 or on the only other day hearings were held, March 10.

Supplemental Appropriation Requested for Vacated Fellowships

As a consequence of the amendments to NDEA passed in December of 1963, the Office of Education asked the House Committee on Appropriations for a supplemental appropriation of \$4,090,000, of which \$1,590,000 was for additional fellowships to implement to the maximum level the expanded authorization. The statement submitted in justification of the request said that the regular appropriation bill, H.R. 5888, signed into Public Law 88-136 on October 11, 1963, by President Kennedy, provided for the support of 4,088 fellows during 1964-65. The amount of \$1,590,000 was requested to support an additional 295 fellows to bring the total number of fellows to be supported up to 4,383. The statement pointed out that the number which could be supported in 1964-65 could not reach 4,500 (1,500 from the 1962-63 class, 1,500 from the 1963-64 class, and 1,500 from the 1964-65 class) because some awards made to fellows in the 1962-63 class and in the 1963-64 class were for only 1 or 2 years and the tenure of these awards would be completed by 1964-65.¹²

At the hearings on February 17, 1964, subcommittee

chairman John Fogarty wanted to know, in connection with the supplemental request, the reasons why the 295 fellows had resigned before completing tenure. Kenneth W. Mildenerger, Director of the Division of College and University Assistance, replied that the Graduate Fellowship Branch had made a study of some of these dropouts. Only 9 percent of them had dropped out because of academic difficulties. Thirty-four percent had changed their academic goals or career plans, 21 percent for personal reasons—finances, marriage, or pregnancy—7 percent for health, 9 percent for no reason given. Dr. Mildenerger said that the 20 percent dropout rate of the title IV program "was considerably lower than the rate in other fellowship programs and in general graduate study."¹³

First Rewards of Vacated Fellowships

Late in April the House of Representatives denied the Office of Education request for supplemental funds with which to reaward vacated fellowships during the spring of 1964, and Dr. Ferguson informed all title IV coordinators that no attempt would be made that year to reaward such fellowships.

A month later, however, on May 28, Dr. Ferguson wrote pertinent title IV coordinators that, because of small savings within the graduate fellowship 1963-64 budget, it had become possible to reaward a small number of these vacated fellowships for use during the academic year 1964-65. The reawarded fellowships would be for only one year of tenure regardless of the academic-year level of the students to whom they were assigned.

Dr. Ferguson wrote that because of the limited funds, no one institution would receive more than one reawarded fellowship no matter how many study programs had experienced vacancies. Furthermore, he could not guarantee that any particular institution would receive even one, but he promised to act as equitably as possible.

In order to reaward as many fellowships as possible, Dr. Ferguson asked the cooperation of title IV coordinators in two ways. He pointed out that very frequently the Office of Education was not notified until fall of the resignations of fellows who resigned at the end of the spring term or during the summer. He said that now, for the first time, the Office of Education would be able to use the money saved through year-end and summer withdrawals if they were reported to the Office in time. For this reason he urged the coordinators to learn the intention of each of their fellows with respect to the resumption of their fellowships the next fall. Fellows who did not plan to resume their fellowships were to be asked to submit their resignations either through the coordinator or directly to the Office by June 6. A written notice of resignation was required from a student before the fellowship could be officially declared vacated.

Dr. Ferguson also asked those title IV coordinators with

¹¹ Ibid., pp. 454-55.

¹² *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1965. Part I. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. 88th Congress, 2d Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964. p. 423.*

¹³ Ibid., p. 385.

vacated 1962 fellowships to submit to him as soon as possible the names, current addresses, and academic departments or programs of at least two students whom they would like to nominate as alternate candidates for reawarded fellowships. These students had to be seeking the doctorate in an approved title IV program in which there was a vacated fellowship which was awarded originally in 1962. They also had to be, of course, legally eligible to hold title IV fellowships and had to complete the same forms that regular nominees submitted. The coordinators were told that if a vacated fellowship was awarded to their institution, they would have to make a nomination in exactly the same manner required of all other title IV fellows. As with original awards, reawards had to be con-

summated by June 30 in order that funds could be obligated from the fiscal 1964 appropriation.

After he received nominations for reawarded fellowships, Dr. Ferguson corresponded with each nominee, informing him that he had been nominated for a National Defense Fellowship for the 1964-65 academic year only. If willing to accept, the candidate was asked to submit to him immediately the forms which he had enclosed. Dr. Ferguson made it clear to the candidate, however, that it was more unlikely than likely that he would receive an award, and he cautioned against counting on it. "In any event," wrote Dr. Ferguson, "I congratulate you for having been accorded this honor, and give you my best wishes for a successful year of graduate study."

CHAPTER IX

seventh year of operation

On July 2, 1964, Representative Edith Green introduced a new bill, H.R. 11904, with nine titles, incorporating several modifications to H.R. 9846. This new bill resulted from hearings held during February and March of 1964. In regard to title IV, this new bill provided that not less than one-third of the fellowships awarded during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, and no fewer than 2,500 for each fiscal year thereafter, be awarded in new or expanded graduate programs. Her preceding bill had stipulated that no fewer than 1,500 fellowships be awarded to fellows in such programs each fiscal year. Subject, of course, to other provisions applying to all title IV fellowships, the Commissioner was free to award the remaining fellowships on such other bases as he might determine.

Another important addition to Mrs. Green's bill was a revocation of the provision in the original NDEA that a full 3-year fellowship could be awarded only to a student in first year of graduate study after the baccalaureate degree. The stipend for the first year of study would remain

\$2,000 per academic year, regardless of how much previous graduate study a fellow had had, \$2,200 for the second year, and \$2,400 for the third year. Most of the technical amendments to title IV would become effective July 1, 1964.

H.R. 11904 Reported Out of Committee

On July 30, 1964, the House Committee on Education and Labor reported out H.R. 11904 with several minor amendments, none of them applying to title IV. One amendment of interest in connection with title IV, however, was that which deleted from section 101, the preamble of the original National Defense Education Act, the clause: "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages and trained in technology." Thus, for the first time, the emphasis on science, mathematics, and engineering was to be excluded from the act.

The report accompanying the bill commented on the recommended amendments to title IV. In regard to the

provision allowing the Commissioner to award the majority of the new fellowships on such bases as he might determine, the Committee on Education and Labor emphasized that the requirement relating to the number of fellowships to be awarded in new or expanded programs was intended to be a minimum requirement. In this connection, the report stressed that the Commissioner, in allocating fellowships, was required to consider two objectives: (1) increasing the number of graduate training facilities, and (2) promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities.¹

In furtherance of the objective of increasing the number of qualified college teachers, H.R. 11904 also provided that the recipients of fellowships under the title had to be persons who were interested in college teaching and were pursuing or intending to pursue a course of study leading to a doctor of philosophy or equivalent degree. The report stated that the term "equivalent degree" should be interpreted to include students pursuing a course of study beyond the first professional degree in law and who intended to teach at a law school.

The report pointed out that the bill would now permit the Commissioner to award fellowships on a 12-month basis where the student continued his academic pursuits during sessions outside the regular session of the graduate program and to make, in such cases, appropriate adjustments in the amount of stipend and dependency allowances. "This provision," the report stated, "is consistent with other Federal fellowship programs, such as the National Science Foundation cooperative fellowship program and the predoctorate fellowship program of the National Institutes of Health, where a stipend for a 12-month fellowship is higher than that for a 9-month fellowship."²

Minority Views on H.R. 11904

There was not Committee unanimity on H.R. 11904, and dissenting views were appended to the report as it was transmitted to the Whole House. Representatives Albert H. Quie, Republican of Minnesota, and Charles E. Goodell, Republican of New York, declared that NDEA was never intended as a vehicle for general aid to education or as an assumption of permanent Federal responsibilities. They asserted that "the unwarranted expansion of the act proposed in H.R. 11904 gives additional substance to the view that limited Federal aid leads to ever increasing Federal intervention in education, with inevitable consequence of weakening support for this act."³

Mr. Quie and Mr. Goodell were critical of the amendments to title IV. In their joint statement, they said:

"The bill would expand the number of fellowships awarded under Title IV from 1,500 annually to 10,000 annually, and would do so in a 2-year period. Moreover, it would minimize the fundamental purpose of the program

to expand the base of graduate education in the country; only one-third of the fellowships would be awarded for new or expanded graduate programs, a requirement applying to all fellowships in the present act. Also, the direction to the Commissioner of Education to seek geographic spread in the program would be eliminated. Thus a fundamental purpose of the title would be seriously compromised.

"Aside from Office of Education spokesmen, there was little support for this precipitous increase in the number of fellowships awarded under the act. Experts in graduate education have very grave doubts that any such increase could be accomplished without a serious weakening of the quality of candidates for fellowships and of the graduate program itself. Any such result would be unfortunate.

"The philosophy of Federal interest inherent in this huge increase, and in the virtual abandonment of the idea of expanding the base of graduate education, is radically different from that of the existing act. The philosophy of this bill is that the Federal Government should assume the lion's share of the total national effort in graduate education. This is evident when we compare the 10,000 fellowships proposed in this bill with the total number of Ph. D. degrees awarded last year—12,822.

"The general public is not aware of the enormous Federal contribution to graduate education. In fiscal 1962, Federal agencies financed over 35,000 graduate students through fellowships and traineeships, at a cost of over \$103 million. In addition, these agencies paid part or all the costs for 19,350 graduate research assistants. Most of these students are working in the physical and biological sciences which relate directly to major Federal interests, as for example, high-energy physics. This fact accounts for a further erroneous assumption in this bill.

"It is assumed that because the Federal Government—of necessity in the interest of national defense—makes a heavy contribution to graduate education in science, it must 'balance' this with a heavy commitment in the humanities and arts. The application of this 'balance' theory would require us to match every outlay for a direct governmental interest with an expenditure for interests that are indirect or remote. To say the least, this is a novel theory of governmental responsibility. On the basis of the hearings thus far, I cannot adopt such an outlook on education in this country."⁴

In addition to Mr. Quie and Mr. Goodell, four other Republican Representatives (Donald C. Bruce of Indiana, John M. Ashbrook of Ohio, M. G. (Gene) Snyder of Kentucky, and Paul Findley of Illinois) appended a joint statement of minority views. First they cited the well-known quote of Senator Barry Goldwater in the 1958 Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare report on the original NDEA:

"This bill and the foregoing remarks of the majority remind me of an old Arabian proverb: 'If a camel once gets his nose in a tent, his body will soon follow.' If adopted, the legislation will mark the inception of aid,

¹ Report No. 1639. House. 88th Congress, 2d Session. July 30, 1964. p. 9.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid., p. 51.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 52-53.

supervision, and ultimately control of education in this country by Federal authorities." ⁵

The four men declared that H.R. 11904 represented a considerable part of the "body" of the "camel" of Federal control of education. In regard to title IV they contended that "the attempt to expand the number of fellowships by more than six times in a 2-year period completely ignores the realities of graduate education in this country." They argued that the increased number of Ph. D. candidates could be absorbed only at the expense of quality in graduate education. They said that the purpose of the title IV amendments was to have the Federal Government pay for a greater part of all graduate education, despite the fact that Federal expenditures in support of graduate education was at that time exceeding \$100 million annually.

Senate Committee Reports Out a Clean Bill, S. 3060

On July 31, 1964, 1 day after the House reported out H.R. 11904, Senator Morse, for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported out a clean bill, S. 3060, to amend and extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas).

Title IV of S. 3060 was identical to that of H.R. 11904, except for one difference. The Senate bill permitted the Commissioner to pay up to \$4,800 for fellows who, prior to going on tenure, had had 2 or more academic years of teaching experience at a college or university; the House bill had no such provision.

The Senate report stated that the expansion in fellowships was badly needed:

"The bill would authorize the award of 5,000 fellowships in fiscal year 1965, 7,500 in fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 in each of the two succeeding fiscal years. This increase from the present authorization of 1,500 fellowships per year reflects the fact that the need for well-qualified college teachers is still growing far more rapidly than the supply.

"Office of Education projections estimate conservatively that college and university enrollments will nearly double between 1963 and 1975, rising from 4.5 million students to 8.6 million. The Nation's 4-year colleges and universities alone will need to hire approximately 288,000 new faculty members to instruct these students between 1964 and 1974. Yet, the same projections estimate that only about 87,000 such persons, or less than 30 percent of the minimum number of new teachers needed, will be available for college teaching at the present rate of doctoral degree achievement.

"Clearly, the supply will be alarmingly out of proportion to the need. A serious deterioration in the quality and availability of college and university instruction will occur unless immediate steps are taken to create additional opportunities and facilities for the production of doctoral degree holders. These new national defense graduate fellowships will permit the Federal Government to cooperate with in-

stitutions of higher education in the development of these opportunities and facilities." ⁶

Republican Senators Barry Goldwater of Arizona and John G. Tower of Texas filed minority views in which they stated that they were opposed to all the provisions of S. 3060 except those in title II of the bill extending for a period of 2 years Public Laws 815 and 874 which dealt with federally impacted areas. They said that with the enactment of S. 3060, "the National Defense Education Act would be transformed into a program which approximates a species of general Federal aid to education, and in which the provisions related to the national defense have become the less important portion of the legislation. To paraphrase a well-known expression, what we are witnessing is the slow but relentless advent of Federal regulation of education carried out on the installment plan and seeking to remain undetected under the protective cloak of 'national defense.' " ⁷

S. 3060 Passed by Senate

S. 3060 was taken up for consideration on the Senate floor by unanimous consent on August 1, 1964, the day after it had been reported out of Committee. In asking and receiving unanimous consent, Senator Mansfield, Democrat of Montana and Senate Majority Leader, said that he understood that consideration of the bill would "take little time."

Senator Morse, floor manager of the bill, praised the bipartisan cooperation in formulating the bill. "This bill bears upon it the mark of our combined judgment in almost every area." ⁸ He said that several Senators had sought to be cosponsors of the bill but, since it was an original one from Committee, according to precedents controlling the Senate, cosponsors could not be added. Therefore, he wanted the *Congressional Record* to show that the following Senators had expressed to the bill clerk their desire to be associated with the legislation:

Senators Joseph S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania; John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky; J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas; Lister Hill, Democrat of Alabama; Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota; Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York; Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts; Thomas H. Kuchel, Republican of California; Michael J. Mansfield, Democrat of Montana; Patrick V. McNamara, Democrat of Michigan; Lee Metcalf, Democrat of Montana; Claiborne Pell, Democrat of Rhode Island; Winston L. Prouty, Republican of Vermont; Jennings Randolph, Democrat of West Virginia; Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey; and Ralph W. Yarborough, Democrat of Texas.⁹

⁶ Report No. 1275. Senate, 88th Congress, 2d Session, July 31, 1964, p. 11.

⁷ Ibid., p. 78.

⁸ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 110, Part 13, August 1, 1964, p. 17690.

⁹ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., p. 56.

Senator Morse told the Senate that S. 3060 had received the favorable vote of all members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, except Senator Tower and Senator Goldwater who, although opposed to all parts of the bill except extension of Public Laws 814 and 874, had raised no objections to expediting the measure to the floor of the Senate.

After a brief discussion, none of which pertained to title IV of NDEA except Senator Morse's brief reference to it in describing the various provisions of the bill, S. 3060 was passed by a voice vote. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table. The bill was then sent to the House for consideration.

House Considers H.R. 11904

H.R. 11904, which had been reported out the House Education and Labor Committee on July 30, 1964, did not get a rule from the Rules Committee until August 13. This rule, House Resolution 852, permitted a maximum of 2 hours of general debate on the bill, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor. In addition, 5 minutes debate was allowed on each amendment. The resolution stated that it would also be in order to consider, without any intervention of point of order, the text of the bill (H.R. 12363 introduced by Mrs. Green on August 12) to extend Public Law 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas) for 1 year until June 30, 1966, as an amendment to the bill. The resolution also provided that, after the passage of H.R. 11904, it would be in order for the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3060 and to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3060 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 11904 as passed by the House.

H.R. 11904 was taken up for consideration on the floor of the House on August 14, 1964, after passage of House Resolution 852 upon a motion by Mrs. Green. Before the passage of the resolution, speaker after speaker, both Democrat and Republican, arose and spoke in praise of Representative Carl Elliott, who had just been defeated in a congressional primary in Alabama. Representative Richard Bolling, Democrat of Missouri, who as a member of the Committee on Rules had the honor of calling up House Resolution 852, and who gave the first tribute, expressed the sentiment of a good many of his colleagues when he said:

"Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes to speak about a colleague of ours who will not be with us after this session of Congress, who was the father of the National Defense Education Act when it was passed in 1958, the author of the bill, the individual who steered it through the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Alabama, our distinguished and able colleague, the Honorable Carl Elliott. I know of no man in the history of the American Congress, and I say advisedly the history of the American Congress, who has done more for the cause of

education than has Carl Elliott. His loss to the country and to the Congress is a great one."¹⁰

Mrs. Green served as floor manager for her bill. When it came time for amendments, Representative Albert H. Quie offered amendment to title IV. In place of the 5,000 fellowships for fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the 7,500 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the 10,000 for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, as provided by the bill, the Quie amendment provided for 3,000; 5,000; and 6,500 fellowships, respectively. Whereas H.R. 11904 provided that not less than one-third of the new fellowships were to go to new or expanded programs in fiscal years ending June 30, 1965, and June 30, 1966, and no fewer than 2,500 for each fiscal year thereafter, the Quie amendment provided for no fewer than 1,500 for the first year and one-third of them thereafter.

In support of his amendment, Mr. Quie said:

"My amendment would provide for an increase to 3,000 the first year, that it be doubled from the present. The second year it would provide for an increase by another 2,000 to 5,000. In the last year it would be increased by another 1,500 to 6,500.

"From everybody I have talked to I get the impression that this is more than adequate to provide for the needs of fellowships in the 3 years. This, as Members know, is for training and education of Ph. D.'s for college teaching. I feel that this is in line with what is needed today."¹¹

Mrs. Green reluctantly agreed to accept the Quie amendment:

"In regard to the current fiscal year and the number suggested in the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota, I am not at all disturbed, because I believe that probably this is the number that could really be used.

"However, the fellowship program was designed originally to maintain and to improve the quality of and preparation of our college faculties. As one member of the subcommittee, I am concerned about statistics which show that the percentage of new college professors with Ph. D.'s is declining. We have a smaller percentage of Ph. D.'s now than we had 10 years ago.

"However, because this will give the committee an opportunity to look at the problem again next year and in the interest of getting a bill passed in this session of Congress, I reluctantly accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota."¹²

Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, rose in opposition to the Quie amendment. He referred to the sentence in the House report accompanying the bill that the House Committee had approved the number of fellowships only "after a thorough discussion of the Title

¹⁰ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 110, Part 15, August 14, 1964, p. 19655. It is interesting that the prime movers in getting NDEA started in 1958 were both from Alabama (Mr. Elliott in the House and Senator Hill in the Senate) while the prime movers in getting NDEA extended and amended were both from Oregon (Mrs. Green in the House and Senator Morse in the Senate).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 19684.

¹² *Ibid.*

IV program and the estimated needs." He asserted that the House bill on this particular point was "in full accord with the Title IV program approved by the other body." Mr. Quie replied by saying that the House should not be influenced by what the Senate had done in regard to this legislation because it spent virtually no time at all considering or studying it. He said that all of the study on this matter had been done in the House and that he had been involved in it.

The Quie amendment was agreed to by the House. There was no further comment on the title IV program during the remainder of the discussion of H.R. 11904 which, along with a number of other amendments, including extension of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress (federally affected areas), was passed by a voice vote.

Immediately thereafter, Mrs. Green offered an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 3060 and insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 11904, as passed. Her amendment was agreed to by a voice vote, and the amended bill was sent back to the Senate.

Conference Report

On August 31, 1964, in a motion by Senator Morse, the Senate disagreed with the House amendment to its bill, S. 3060, and requested a conference with the House thereon. The President pro tem appointed nine conferees (six Democrats, three Republicans).¹³ On September 1, Mrs. Green asked unanimous consent that the House insist on the House amendments to S. 3060 and agree to a conference. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, Republican of New Jersey, objected because of a dispute over the number of minority members who would serve on the conference committee.

On September 16, Chairman Adam Clayton Powell of the House Committee on Education and Labor again asked unanimous consent to go to conference with the Senate in regard to S. 3060. This time the House agreed, after this explanation of the views of the minority side by Representative Donald C. Bruce, Republican of Indiana:

"Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object at this time, there has been a great deal of concern on the side of the minority as to what the approach is going to be in the conference committee. We are not at this point completely assured that the House position is going to be firmly maintained. We also recognize the importance of this legislation and feel that we cannot any longer take the position of objecting although we feel, from the standpoint of many of us, that there are some objectionable possibilities coming out of this conference report.

"It is our firm hope that the House Members of the conference committee will stand as firmly as humanly possible

¹³The Democratic conferees named were Wayne Morse of Oregon, Lister Hill of Alabama, Patrick McNamara of Michigan, Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania and Jennings Randolph of West Virginia. The Republican conferees named were Winston L. Prouty of Vermont, Barry Goldwater of Arizona, and Jacob K. Javits of New York.

for the House position on this piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection." ¹⁴ The Speaker thereupon appointed 13 conferees (eight Democrats and five Republicans).¹⁵

The conference committee issued its report on September 30, 1964, outlining the agreements which were reached. The Senate bill extended the programs provided for in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for 3 additional years beyond the expiration date of June 30, 1965. The House amendment extended the act for only 2 additional years. The substitute agreed upon in conference extended the act for 3 additional years. It extended the Federal impact legislation for one year. According to the report, in most respects the substitute bill agreed in conference was like the House amendment to S. 3060. The provision of the House bill striking out the clause "which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology" was retained. With regard to conference agreement on title IV, the managers on the part of the House had this to say:

"The Senate bill authorized the Commissioner of Education to award 5,000 fellowships for graduate study during the fiscal year 1965, 7,500 during the fiscal year 1966, and 10,000 during the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

"The House amendment authorized the Commissioner to award 3,000 such fellowships during the fiscal year 1965, 5,000 during the fiscal year 1966, and 6,500 during the fiscal year 1967.

"The conference substitute authorizes the Commissioner of Education to award 3,000 fellowships for graduate study during fiscal year 1965, 6,000 during fiscal year 1966, and 7,500 during fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

"The Senate bill provides that of the fellowships to be awarded during a fiscal year not less than one-third of those to be awarded in fiscal years 1965 and 1966, and not less than 2,500 for each fiscal year thereafter, shall be awarded to persons who will study in new or expanded graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under section 403(a). The House amendment provides that for fiscal year 1965, 1,500 of the fellowships awarded must be for study in such new or expanded programs and that thereafter one-third of such fellowships must be for study in such new and expanded programs. The conference substitute adopts the House provision in this instance." ¹⁶

¹⁴*Congressional Record*. Vol. 110, Part 17. September 16, 1964. p. 22202.

¹⁵The Democratic conferees named were Adam Clayton Powell of New York, Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky, Edith Green of Oregon, John Brademas of Indiana, James Roosevelt of California, Carlton R. Sickles of Maryland, Sam M. Gibbons of Florida, and John H. Dent of Pennsylvania. The Republican conferees named were Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, Charles E. Goodell of New York, Robert P. Griffin of Michigan, and Paul Findley of Illinois.

¹⁶*Report No. 1916*. House. 88th Congress, 2d Session. September 30, 1964. p. 15.

Conference Report Accepted by House and Senate

The House was the first to act on the conference report when Mr. Powell called it up for consideration on October 1, 1964. As leader of the House conferees, he explained the details of the agreement which had been reached with the Senate conferees. In regard to title IV, he said:

"In reaching an agreement in regard to the number of fellowships to be awarded, the conferees agreed upon an average between the numbers adopted by the House and the Senate. Thus, the conference report recommends that the following awards be made: 3,000 for fiscal year 1965; 6,000 for fiscal year 1966; 7,500 for fiscal year 1967; and 7,500 for fiscal year 1968. In determining the percentage of fellowships to be awarded to new or expanding programs the conference substitute adopted the House provision. The Senate receded in its recommendation that a special stipend of \$4,800 be awarded to teachers who have had two or more academic years of teaching experience at a college or university."¹⁷

Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen attacked the conference report:

"I should like to point out this was an unusual conference. There were 22 conferees on this bill. Thirteen of those came from this body, 8 from the majority and 5 from the minority. No member of the minority signed the conference report. This, I might say, was not because we disapproved of the basic objectives of the National Defense Act. Many of us were cosponsors of the original legislation.

"However, as a conferee I feel very strongly that we had the position of the House to maintain in the conference, and on every point of significance concession was made to the point of view of the other body."¹⁸

Mr. Frelinghuysen said that he strongly disagreed with the language in the conference report which stated that "in most respects the substitute agreed in conference is like the House amendment." He was joined in his attack on the conference report by the four other Republican members of the House who served on the conference committee—Mr. Quie of Minnesota, Mr. Goodell of New York, Mr. Griffin of Michigan, and Mr. Findley of Illinois. Mr. Goodell made a motion to recommit the bill to conference with certain specified instructions to be insisted upon by the managers of the House. His motion was defeated by a record vote of 107 yeas and 236 nays, with 87 not voting. Immediately thereafter, the conference report itself was agreed to by a record vote of 320 yeas, 20 nays, 88 not voting, and 2 answering "present."

The conference report was considered on the floor of the Senate on October 2, 1964, at the request of Senator Morse, who explained his purpose in discussing the details of the report:

"Mr. President, for the purpose of providing the legislative history regarding the conference report, I am under an obligation to, and in fact under instructions from, my col-

leagues on the committee and the House managers to discuss briefly the basis upon which agreement was reached. I shall take the time to do so because the legislative history we make here today may be of utmost importance in the years ahead in administering the Act. The report I make today supplements the report of the House managers, our conference practice being that the Senate conferees do not file a written report. Therefore, it is important that we leave no room for doubt as to the meaning of any part of the bill.

"Before I do so, however, I should like to express my deepest appreciation to Senators who served with me on the conference committee for the valuable support which they gave to the Senate position on this important legislation.

"The President of the United States, in signing legislation that has been passed in the 88th Congress, said that this Congress had passed more educational legislation of greater import than had been enacted by any other Congress in the past 100 years. He referred to the Morrill Act of 1862 as being the last piece of major legislation on education, other than the National Defense Education Act of 1958, prior to the various bills that have been passed in the 88th Congress."¹⁹

Senator Morse stated that all the Senators who participated in the conference signed the conference report. He said he believed, however, that Senator Goldwater, a conferee who did not participate because he was campaigning for the Presidency as Republican nominee, would not have signed it. He lauded the bipartisan support received from all Senate conferees.

In explaining the agreement reached on title IV, Senator Morse reported:

"The following title of the National Defense Education Act currently provides for 1,500 fellowships annually. The Senate version of S. 3060 expanded this program, which is of major importance if we are to expand our higher educational teaching forces, from the present 1,500 figure to 5,000 fellowships for this fiscal year, 7,500 fellowships for fiscal year 1966, and the Commissioner would have been authorized for the final 2 years to award not to exceed 10,000 fellowships annually.

"I can assure the Senate that we attempted to maintain these figures which I personally believe are fully justified by the evidence presented in our hearings. However, as Senators are aware, it is necessary at times to secure agreements to concede items of quantity provided that principles of quality are maintained. In this instance, both House and Senate retreated from the original positions and accepted the program which will provide a doubling of scholarships this year to 3,000, a doubling of that figure for the next fiscal year to 6,000, and an increase thereafter for the final 2 years of the program to 7,500 fellowships annually.

"Other modifications to this title which are shown in the summary were largely of a conforming nature dictated by the policy decision on the number of fellowships to be established. I regret, however, that we were unable to

¹⁷ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 110, Part 18, October 1, 1964, p. 23369.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 23371.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 23486.

maintain the increased stipend provisions of the Senate bill." ²⁰

Before S. 3060 was passed by a voice vote and sent on to the President for his signature, Senator Morse was praised by a number of Senators for his leadership in conceptualizing the legislation and guiding it to its successful conclusion. This quotation from Senator Alan Bible, Democrat of Nevada, is a representative one:

"I would not wish to permit this opportunity to go by without paying my respects and commendation to the senior Senator from Oregon for the landmark work that he has done in this particular field. I recognize him as a leader in many fields, but in the field of education he is probably the foremost leader. I salute him for a task well done." ²¹

President Johnson Signs S. 3060 Into Law

On October 16, 1964, 14 days after its final passage by the Senate, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed S. 3060 into law, thus creating Public Law 88-665. At the signing ceremony, he hailed the legislation in these words:

"The 88th Congress is gone but its good works continue. The measure before me is one of the finest works of this very fine year."

The President noted in his remarks that under this legislation the number of college teachers who could be trained was increased five-fold over the previous level. He singled out for praise in getting the legislation passed the efforts of Senators Morse and Yarborough and Representatives Powell, Perkins, and Green.

The Language of Title IV as a Result of Amendments of 1963 and 1964

The amendments of 1963, and particularly of 1964, were very significant so far as title IV was concerned. These amendments remained in effect until new amendments to NDEA were passed in the fall of 1968 and therefore represented a considerable portion of the first 10 years of title IV existence. Following is the exact language of the law as it resulted from the amendments of 1963 and 1964:

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 402. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed three thousand fellowships to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, he is authorized to award not to exceed six thousand such fellowships, and during each of the two succeeding fiscal years, he is authorized to award not to exceed seven thousand five hundred such fellowships.

Such fellowships may be awarded for such period of study as the Commissioner may determine, but not in excess of three academic years, except that where a fellowship holder pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at the institution during periods outside the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, a fellowship may be awarded for a period not in excess of three calendar years.*

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 403. (a) Of the total number of fellowships authorized by section 402 (a) to be awarded during a fiscal year (1) not less than one thousand five hundred of such fellowships awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not less than one-third of such fellowships awarded during the three succeeding fiscal years shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) the remainder shall be awarded on such basis as he may determine, subject to the provisions of subsection (c). The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded, and

(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation.

(b) The total of the fellowships awarded as described in clause (1) of subsection (a) for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher education may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a)(2), and the Commissioner shall give consideration to such objective in determining the number of fellowships awarded under this title for attendance at any one institution of higher education.

(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are interested in teaching, or continuing to teach, in institutions of higher education and are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree.

(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.*

FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

SEC. 404. (a) Each person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall receive a stipend of \$2,000 for the first academic year of study, \$2,200 for the second year, and \$2,400 for the third such year, plus an additional amount of \$400 for each such year on

²⁰ Ibid., p. 23490.

²¹ Ibid., p. 23496.

* By secs. 401 and 402(d) of Public Law 88-665, the revision of subsecs. 402(a), 403(a), and 403(b), and the insertion of subsecs. 404(c) and 404(d) is effective July 1 1964.

account of each of his dependents. Where a person awarded a fellowship under this title for study at an institution of higher education pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at such institution during periods outside of the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, the Commissioner may make appropriate adjustments in his stipends and allowances for dependents.

(b) In addition to the amounts paid to persons pursuant to subsection (a) there shall be paid to the institution of higher education at which each such person is pursuing his course of study \$2,500 per academic year, less any amount charged such person for tuition.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

Supplemental Appropriation Bill Signed Into Law

S. 3060 authorized a number of expansions in NDEA programs that could take effect in fiscal year 1965. The regular appropriation bill allowed only for a continuation of the title IV program at the previously authorized level. Of course, an expansion from 1,500 to 3,000 new fellowships to commence in the fall of 1965 required additional funds to implement the expanded authorization. Congress provided for this by passing a supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 12633) of \$60,750,000 for Defense Educational Activities. This appropriation would be available only upon enactment of S. 3060, 88th Congress, or similar legislation amending the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Included in the bill, which was signed into law as Public Law 88-635 by President Johnson on October 7, 1964, was authorization for 20 new positions in the Office of Education for the administration of the graduate fellowship program.

Regular Appropriation for Fiscal Year 1966

In order to implement fully the expansion in the number of fellowships authorized by the 1964 amendments, the Office of Education requested of the 89th Congress a fiscal year 1966 appropriation of \$58,108,000. This amount, which was \$25,368,000 greater than the preceding year's appropriation, was requested in order to support during 1966-67 a total of 10,494 fellows—6,000 first-year fellowships, 2,897 second-year fellowships, and 1,597 third-year fellowships—during regular sessions and 9,444 fellows (90 percent of 10,494) during summer sessions.

At the hearing on February 4, 1965, before the House Appropriations Committee, Commissioner of Education Keppel termed the title IV program "most successful in encouraging increased numbers of capable young people to receive the training essential for college or university teaching careers, and for encouraging the development, fuller

utilization, and wider geographical distribution of graduate programs." ²²

Both the House and the Senate approved the \$58,108,000 request for title IV fellowships, and H.R. 7765 was signed by President Johnson into Public Law 89-156 on August 31, 1965. The law still retained the clause that no part of the appropriation could be made available for graduate fellowships which were not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purposes of NDEA as stated in section 101 thereof.

Planning for Implementation of 1964 Amendments

Alan Ferguson continued as head of the Graduate Fellowship Branch a second year. By the first part of August, with both the Senate and House Committees having reported out comparable bills on extending and amending NDEA, Office of Education officials began to give serious thought to the almost certain upcoming task of implementing a major expansion and modification of the title IV program. Dr. Ferguson, on August 14, 1964, wrote a memorandum to Commissioner Keppel outlining his thinking in regard to this important matter:

"What I am aiming at here is something we can use at once to get the awards out for use in 1965-66, but in which we can begin our drive toward clarification and development of the centers of excellence concept. We cannot expect much action of a "center" nature in the first year. By 1966-67, however, we should arouse considerable interest. By 1967-68, I would hope that most of our awards would be in that direction. It will take that long for most schools to prepare their plans and for us to develop the coordination of effort we need among both our own related programs and those of other Federal agencies.

"I propose that we exercise considerable administrative discretionary power in the selection of schools receiving major support. Two-thirds of Title IV awards should be made on that basis. If this is done I estimate that we will have enough power in Title IV to be a major factor in creating 50-60 large excellent centers of graduate study within a five to ten year period. One-third of the awards could be used for more general and fragmented support for schools already at or working toward the 'center' stage."

In his memorandum, Dr. Ferguson indicated that his thinking at that time was first to review applications on a purely qualitative basis by using panels of the best faculty drawn from the entire Nation, and then to pass these evaluations, plus other relevant data about pertinent institutions, on to regional committees. These regional committees would then make selective recommendations as to which schools and programs in each region should be supported.

"Centers of Excellence" Concept

It was clear that Dr. Ferguson was moving in the direc-

²² *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation for 1966. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. House. 89th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965. p. 463.*

tion of favoring the development of a "centers of excellence" concept. The development of centers of excellence with Federal assistance was not a new idea. Back in 1960 the Panel on Basic Research and Graduate Education of the President's Science Advisory Committee estimated that there were then in existence 15 or 20 "first-rate academic centers of excellence" and expressed the wish that there might be 30 or 40 such centers in existence within 15 years.²³

In addition, Jerome B. Wiesner, the President's Science Advisor, had since his appointment in 1961 been placing a higher premium on quality than on quantity in graduate education. He was a leading advocate of the development of additional centers of excellence in the United States. At his urging, the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had in 1963 each established such a program in the science fields. It was to be expected, therefore, in view of these developments, that the Office of Education would give serious consideration to this concept with respect to the totality of graduate education.

The Title IV Advisory Committee and a number of consultants met in the summer of 1964 and reviewed the applications. After review and evaluation, 619 program proposals at 152 institutions were recommended for approval. To these 619 programs were tentatively allocated 1,710 fellowships. If prior practice were followed, the Office of Education staff, perhaps augmented by two or three Advisory Committee members, would have soon thereafter made final selection of the 1,500 fellowship awards that had been authorized by legislation. This time, however, with passage imminent of legislation which would significantly expand the number of fellowships, Dr. Ferguson decided not to cut down the number from 1,710 to 1,500 immediately, but rather to wait and see what the actual amendments to title IV were.

When President Johnson signed the law amending NDEA on October 16, 1964, it became definitely known that 3,000 new fellowships, to commence in the fall of 1965, could be awarded. The new law required that no fewer than 1,500 of these fellowships were to be allocated to new or expanded programs. The decision was then made in the Office of Education to accept unchanged the recommendations of the Title IV Advisory Committee involving 1,710 fellowship allocations and to reserve the remaining 1,290 for a competition to be held later in the fiscal year.

A notification was sent October 23, 1964, to Members of Congress on the 619 approved programs and 1,710 fellowship allocations. Shortly thereafter a news release was issued.

Commissioner's Informal Meeting on November 7, 1964

In order to obtain counsel in regard to implementation of the far-reaching 1964 amendments to title IV, Commissioner Keppel invited a small group of university ad-

ministrators, representatives of graduate school associations, and Federal agency representatives to meet on November 7, 1964, with him, Dr. Ferguson, and Dr. Blessing, who had been moved up to the position of Assistant Director of the Graduate Fellowship Program.²⁴ This was an informal meeting to discuss implications of the new legislation and possible new directions of the Graduate Fellowship Program, in advance of the Commissioner's meeting with the Title IV Advisory Committee the following week.

Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of November 14, 1964

The Title IV Advisory Committee meeting of November 14, 1964, was an extremely significant one because of the many important policy decisions that had to be made as a result of the legislation just passed. Commissioner Keppel participated in the Committee deliberations.

The Committee endorsed the centers-of-excellence concept. It recommended that allocations of fellowships be patterned so as to provide maximum opportunities for graduate study development to a selected number of institutions and reasonable measures of support for eligible doctoral study programs of actual and potential excellence wherever they might be found in other institutions. The Committee felt that an effort should be made, in allocating the small number of fellowships still available for 1965-66, to restrict the number of schools supported to about 50. A suggestion that only that many institutions be invited to apply was rejected in favor of an application procedure that would be severe enough to have the same effect.

The Committee recommended that the title IV program place a strong emphasis upon having the new fellowships result in an expansion in the enrollments of full-time graduate students seeking the doctorate. This emphasis was to be made clear in the information sent to the schools regarding application procedures. Low priority was to be given to any applicant not presenting evidence of ability to expand in the study programs for which support was being requested. The Committee was informed about and agreed wholeheartedly with the view that the title IV program should be closely coordinated with other Federal programs, both in the Office of Education and in outside agencies.

In addition to the major policy decisions just en-

²⁴ The following persons were invited to attend this meeting: Gustave O. Arlt, President, Council of Graduate Schools of the United States; John W. Ashton, Vice President, Indiana University; Kingman Brewster, Jr., President, Yale University; Alan M. Cartter, Vice President, American Council on Education; Eugene A. Confrey, Chief, Division of Research Grants, National Institutes of Health; Frank Hansing, University Program Manager, Grants and Research Contracts, Office of Space Science, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Fred H. Harrington, President, University of Wisconsin; Rev. Robert J. Henle, Vice President, Saint Louis University; Herbert Longenecker, President, Tulane University; Henry W. Riecken, Associate Director, National Science Foundation; John F. Sherman, Associate Director for Extramural Programs, National Institutes of Health; Edward W. Strong, Chancellor, University of California at Berkeley; John C. Weaver, Vice President, Ohio State University; and O. Meredith Wilson, President, University of Minnesota.

²³ *Scientific Progress, the University and the Federal Government*. The White House, November 15, 1960. p. 14.

numerated, the Committee made a number of other recommendations pertaining to the award of new and vacated fellowships. These were implemented and are described in the memorandum discussed in the following section.

Institutions Notified of New Policies

On December 22, 1964, Commissioner Keppel sent a memorandum to presidents of doctorate-granting institutions informing them of the new policy decisions affecting the title IV program. He wrote, in part:

"Henceforth we shall seek to foster through this program both existing and developing centers of excellence in graduate education. We believe that the new policies and procedures which we are now adopting for the allocation of these fellowships will contribute much to the achievement of this objective. . . .

"We envisage that some institutions may qualify for as many as 150 Title IV fellowships per year for three years beginning in 1966. Since each fellowship provides student and institutional support for three years, an institution receiving an allocation of this dimension would receive institutional allowance funds totaling \$3,375,000 over the five-year period during which awards would be active. At the same time we shall not overlook the need to support the development of doctoral training of high quality at institutions with a limited number of doctoral programs, or at those which could accommodate only a limited number of fellowships."

The Commissioner went on to say that, because of the little time remaining prior to selection and nomination of candidates for fellowships to begin in the fall 1965 term, certain of the new policies and procedures as outlined in the memorandum would not be fully implemented as they related to these fellowships. The guidelines which accompanied the memorandum were therefore divided into two parts—policies and procedures pertinent to 1965 fellowships and those pertinent to awards authorized for 1966. The guidelines contained three sections.

New Guidelines for Allocation of Fellowships

Section I, "Fellowship Allocation Policies," outlined the new policies and priorities for the allocation of fellowships to institutions for 1965-66 and 1966-67. The fundamental objectives of the graduate fellowship program, as stated, were:

1. To increase the number of persons interested in and trained for professional careers as college or university teachers.
2. To encourage the development and full utilization of the capacities of new, expanded, and ongoing graduate study programs leading to the doctorate.
3. To promote a wider geographical distribution of graduate study programs leading to the degree of doctor of philosophy, or its equivalent.

In seeking to achieve these objectives, the Office of Education proposed to allocate title IV fellowships to eligible graduate institutions in such ways as to effect an expansion

in the enrollment of full-time students, and to provide opportunities for the growth and development of graduate study programs of excellence.

Whereas title IV fellowships previously had been allocated on the basis of applications submitted through institutions by departments or other academic units of graduate study, and in specifically approved programs of study, henceforth they were to be allocated *en bloc* to an institution on the basis of a single institutional application encompassing all the graduate study programs for which fellowships were requested. Assignments of specified numbers of fellowships for award to students enrolled in specific departments or other academic units of study would be left to the discretion of the institutions. Such assignments had, however, to be restricted to those graduate study programs encompassed in the institutional application and for which support had been specifically authorized in the Commissioner's notice of allocation of fellowships.

Fellowships could not be allocated to any institution which did not offer the degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree. Fellowships could be allocated, however, for the support of students enrolled in graduate study programs offered jointly by two or more institutions. Where, in such a program, only one participating institution offered the doctorate, any allocation of fellowships would be made to that institution only.

Where more than one participating institution offered the doctorate to students enrolled in the program, each such institution was asked to incorporate the program in its overall application if it desired support for the program.

In making fellowship allocations, the Office of Education planned to give the highest priority to applications which could be approved *in toto*. Such applications would be those presenting evidence of the most complete plans for the development, expansion, and full utilization of graduate study programs of excellence over the widest range of fields of study.

Institutions whose applications could not be approved *in toto* could, however, be granted an allocation of fellowships for award to students enrolled in certain specified graduate study programs. In making such allocations, the Office planned to give priority to graduate study programs for which fellowships for 1965 had not previously been requested.

Allocation of Fellowships for Tenure Starting with Fall Term, 1965

Institutions were informed that institutional applications for the remaining 1,290 fellowships of the 3,000 authorized to be awarded in fiscal year 1965, had to be submitted by January 22, 1965, with the allocations to be announced on or about March 1, 1965. They were also told that no single institution would be awarded more than 75 fellowships from the total authorized for 1965. This total included any fellowships allocated to the institution in the announcement of October 24, 1964, in which 1,710 fellowships were allocated.

Additionally, of the remaining 1,290 fellowships no fewer than 20 would be allocated to any one institution. An institution which could not demonstrate that the graduate study programs encompassed in its application for these fellowships could accommodate at least 20 full-time students, in addition to the normally expected enrollment for the academic year 1965-66, would not receive an allocation of these fellowships.

Allocations of fellowships authorized for award in 1965, including those announced on October 24, 1964, would carry no commitment for additional allocations in subsequent years. It was assumed that institutions wishing additional support for specific graduate study programs to which fellowships had been assigned would include such programs in their applications for fellowships in subsequent years.

Allocation of Fellowships for Tenure Starting with Fall Term, 1966

Of the total 6,000 fellowships to be awarded in fiscal year 1966 (subject, of course, to appropriation of funds) no fewer than 2,000 were to be allocated to students enrolled in new or expanded programs of graduate study. No single institution was to be awarded more than 150 fellowships, and no institution whose application was approved in whole or in part would be allocated fewer than four fellowships.

In making allocations of these fellowships, the Office of Education would also make a commitment (subject to congressional appropriation of funds and to evidence, in the annual institutional reports, of satisfactory progress in carrying out the graduate study programs supported in 1966) to allocate additional fellowships to the same institutions in each of the two subsequent years at not less than 75 percent of the number of fellowships allocated for initial use in 1966. Such additional allocations would be made on the basis of each institution's application for 1966 fellowships and would not require a new application. Original 1966 applications could, however, be amended at the times set for making subsequent applications.

Institutional applications for allocations of 1966 fellowships had to be submitted by June 1, 1965. Subject to congressional appropriation of funds, the allocations were to be announced on or about September 15, 1965.

Section II of Commissioner Keppel's memorandum dealt with application procedures. Whereas in the past, institutions applying for title IV fellowships had submitted applications for separate departments or other academic units of study, indicating the number of fellowships requested for each, henceforth institutions would submit only one application. This had to include an account both of the total graduate study program at the institution and of those specific parts of that program for which fellowships were requested, and would specify only the total number of fellowships requested.

The application could constitute a request for an allocation of fellowships to be awarded to students enrolled in only one department or other academic unit of study—for

example, in physics; or in each of a group of related units of study—for example, in several social science disciplines; or in each of a group of unrelated units of study—for example, in physics, sociology, English, and elementary education; or in each of two or more groups of related units of study—for example, in a humanities group, a social science group, an engineering group, or a biological science group.

Instructions were given on how to apply for the remaining 1965 fellowships and the 1966 fellowships. For the 1965 fellowships an applicant had to provide a narrative statement not to exceed 10 typed, double-spaced pages, setting forth the institution's plan for developing during the following 5 years the doctoral studies encompassed in the application. This narrative was to include but not be limited to plans for the expansion of full-time student enrollment, staff, and facilities, and the relationship between the activities proposed for support and the institution's total doctoral training activities in terms of present quality and future development. As separate appendixes with separate sequential pagination, there were to be applications for the specific doctoral student programs for which the institution sought approval. Each study program application was required to give detailed data (rank, degrees, publications, etc.) on all faculty who would be significantly involved in the program. Also required was information on graduate enrollments in recent years and projected enrollments, as well as numbers of master's and doctor's degrees awarded and data on the totality of financial support available or anticipated for full-time students in the program. Finally, for each program there had to be a statement not exceeding five typed, double-spaced pages, giving:

1. The general range of course offerings in the program available to students seeking the doctorate.
2. Any particular strengths or relative deficiencies in the program.
3. General and special doctoral degree requirements.
4. General and special facilities available to students seeking the doctorate.

For 1966 fellowship applications, institutions were asked to submit a more detailed statement on its graduate school and graduate plans than was required for 1965 fellowships. Required was a narrative statement of unspecified length giving details of the institution's plans for the general expansion and development of its doctoral training activities in each of the following five years, giving particular attention to those parts of the total program for which fellowship support was being requested. This statement was to include, but not necessarily limited to, the following data:

1. Sufficient historical data to provide an adequate picture of the development of the total graduate study program of the institution, particularly over the preceding three years.
2. Current areas of strength and of deficiencies in the institution's total doctoral training program.
3. Plans for initiating and developing new doctoral training programs.

4. Plans for strengthening and expanding staff and facilities in existing doctoral programs.

5. Plans for expanding graduate student enrollment.

6. Data indicating existing and anticipated sources of graduate student support and amounts currently expended or to be expended.

7. The institution's total budget and expenditures for the current year and the preceding 2 years. This was to indicate major sources of funds and the amounts budgeted and expended for each major unit of instruction (e.g., law, engineering, humanities, social sciences), categorized by purpose of expenditures (e.g., salaries, facilities, research, etc.). The institution's basic salary scale for faculty was asked for.

8. Biographical data concerning the chief administrative officers responsible for policies affecting graduate training activities.

9. Special honors and awards to the institution, its officers, and its faculty during the preceding 3 years.

10. Institutional policy concerning leaves of absence, sabbatical leaves, and support for research and professional activities available to faculty.

11. Brief description of institution's undergraduate program.

12. Comment on any interinstitutional arrangements in which the institution participated and on any special role the institution played in its geographical region.

A separate appendix, with sequential pagination, was to be attached for each department or other academic unit of study whose graduate study program was included in the application. Each appendix was to follow a prescribed format.

Policies Pertaining to the Award of Regular and Vacated Fellowships

Section III of the Commissioner's memorandum delineated the new policies pertaining to the award of regular and vacated fellowships:

1. Regular Fellowships

- A. All fellowships were to be awarded only for the full tenure period of 3 years.
- B. No fellowship was to be actively used and support paid on its behalf for more than a total of 36 months, nor during more than any three academic years.
- C. All fellowship recipients were to start their studies under the fellowship in the fall term of the year in which the award was made.
- D. Tenure of a fellowship for the full 3 years was conditional upon the fellow's engaging actively, while on fellowship tenure, in essentially full-time study in the graduate study program in which the award was held and upon his maintaining satisfactory proficiency in his studies.
- E. Fellows were not required to use their awards during consecutive academic or calendar years, except as noted later in item G. But a fellow

who interrupted his tenure had to continue to make normal and satisfactory progress in his doctoral program during the period of interruption. A fellow could not interrupt his tenure for the purpose of undertaking employment, except for employment by his institution for work related directly to his doctoral training. No interruption could exceed 2 years.

F. At least 75 percent of all new fellowships each year had to be awarded to students enrolling in a graduate study program for the first time. Up to 25 percent could be awarded to students who had completed no more than 2 years, or their equivalent, of full-time graduate study creditable toward the doctoral degree. No initial awards could be made to students who could reasonably be expected to need less than the full 3 years of tenure to complete the requirements for the doctoral degree; these students would be eligible only for the award of vacated fellowships.

G. All fellows had to complete their 3-year tenure in accordance with the following schedule:

- | | |
|---|--|
| (1) Student with no previous graduate study.* | Within 5 years of date of initial activation of the award. |
| (2) Student with some, but no more than 1 year of graduate study.* | Within 4 years of date of initial activation of the award. |
| (3) Student with more than 1 year, but no more than 2 years of graduate study.* | Within 3 years of date of initial activation of the award. |

* Study creditable toward the doctorate in the program which the fellowship was held.

Exceptions to this schedule were allowed in the cases of fellows granted leaves of absence for medical reasons or for mandatory armed services duty.

- H. No fellowship could be awarded for study at an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program was specifically designed to prepare students to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to teach theological subjects. Nor could fellowships be awarded for study in ancient studies (including the classics and classical archeology), the fine arts, drama, music, religion, home economics, or such other fields of applied social science as might be determined to be outside the provisions of the act.
- I. Fellowships could be awarded only to persons interested in teaching or continuing to teach in institutions of higher education and pursuing or intending to pursue a course of study lead-

ing to the degree of doctor of philosophy or its equivalent.

- J. No fellowships could be awarded for study in any graduate program which did not provide for the award, upon satisfactory completion of the program, of the degree of doctor of philosophy or its equivalent.
- K. No fellowship could be awarded for study in a program for which support had not been specifically authorized by the Commissioner of Education.
- L. Each fellowship provided the following stipends to the holder:

Year of tenure	Academic year stipend	Supplementary stipend for study beyond the regular academic year*
First	\$2,000	\$400
Second	2,200	400
Third	2,400	400

*Supplementary stipends were not to be paid for study during the summer term 1965, but were to be paid for study during the summer term 1966. Students wishing to avail themselves of the latter provision were to be instructed to apply early in 1966.

- M. Each fellowship provided an allowance of \$400 per academic year for each legal dependent of the fellow, plus an additional allowance of \$100 for each such dependent for those periods during which the fellow was receiving a supplementary stipend for study beyond the period of the regular academic year.
- N. Each fellow provided an allowance of \$2,500 per year to the institution at which the fellow was registered and actively using his fellowship. This sum was subject to the deduction of any instructional fee or fees charged directly to the fellow.

2. Vacated Fellowships

- A. Fellowships awarded for activation in the fall term of 1963 or in subsequent fall terms, which had been vacated by the original awardee prior to full use of the original tenure period, were classified as vacated fellowships.
- B. Such fellowships, if vacated at such a time as to leave at least one year of unused tenure, could be reawarded.
- C. No vacated fellowship was to be reawarded for use during less than one full academic year.
- D. Vacated fellowships would, when reawarded, carry all the applicable privileges and be subject to all the applicable provisions of regular fellowships.
- E. Vacated fellowships would normally be reallocated to the institution at which they were originally held, but the decision in this was reserved to the Commissioner of Education.

- F. The Office of Education was to notify each institution each year of the number of vacated fellowships reallocated to it. No institution could reassign such a fellowship, or nominate a candidate for the award of such a fellowship until this notification had been received. No fellowship vacated subsequent to receipt of this notification could be reassigned until permission to do so had been obtained from the Office of Education.
- G. Vacated fellowships containing three years of unused tenure were to be reawarded on the same bases as those pertaining to regular fellowships.
- H. Vacated fellowships containing two years of unused tenure could be reawarded to students who, prior to reactivation of the fellowship, would have completed no more than 3 years of full-time graduate study, or the equivalent, creditable toward the doctorate in the program in which the fellowship was to be held.
- I. Vacated fellowships containing one year of unused tenure could be reawarded to students who, prior to reactivation of the fellowship, would have completed no more than four years of full-time study, or the equivalent, creditable toward the doctorate in the program in which the fellowship was to be held.
- J. A vacated fellowship could be awarded to a student who had previously held a title IV fellowship, but a student who had previously had 2 years of title IV support could only be awarded a fellowship with 1 year of tenure remaining, and a student who had had 1 year of support could only be awarded a fellowship with 2 years or 1 year of tenure remaining.

Agreement Not to Discriminate

If an institution submitted an application for fellowships, the institutional officer responsible for institutional educational policy had to sign an agreement that the institution would comply with the regulations issued under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Following is the wording of the agreement:

AGREEMENT

The attachments hereto are parts of this application. It is understood and agreed (1) that the defined study program(s) will be carried out in accordance with this application, except as changes may be approved by the Commissioner of Education; (2) that the applicant institution will comply, or is complying with the regulations, policies, and procedures formulated by the Commissioner of Education under Title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as amended; (3) that any allotment of these fellowships made to the applicant institution will be subject to the institution's compliance with the regulations issued under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; and (4)

that all statements made in this application are accurate and complete to the applicant's best knowledge and belief.

OFFICIAL AUTHORIZATION FOR INSTITUTION

Signature of officer

Date

Second Competition for 1965 Fellowships

A major shift in the procedure of application review and fellowship allocation occurred during the competition held during the winter of 1965 for the remaining 1,290 fellowships of the 3,000 authorized to be awarded in fiscal 1965 and to commence in the fall of 1965.

In previous competitions the Title IV Advisory Committee, augmented by a panel of consultants which had grown larger each year, read and evaluated each departmental application. With the expansion of the program, the task became too large for the Advisory Committee members. Therefore, on January 14, 1965, Dr. Ferguson sent a memorandum to the 12 members of the Advisory Committee and 36 consultants. He wrote that a new plan was to ask the consultant panels for an evaluation of the quality of each department of study in each institutional application. These were then to be collected for each institution and presented to the Advisory Committee for consideration, together with the institution's narrative statement outlining its plans for growth and development in graduate training. This total package was to be the basis for the final decision on allocation of the fellowships.

By the time of the closeout date of January 22, a total of 160 institutions had submitted applications; 25 institutions which had previously applied did not do so in this competition. Several of the latter schools indicated that the floor of 20 fellowships had influenced their decision not to apply.

The consultant panels were convened at the Office of Education on January 30 and 31 and February 1 to evaluate the departmental doctoral programs. The panelists were informed that, whereas in the past the submitted programs had to be "new" or "expanded" at the time the fellowships were to be activated, the 1964 amendments to NDEA permitted approval of "ongoing" programs with no expansion planned. The guidelines given the panelists for review of applications stated that such ongoing programs were to be given first priority in the allocation of the 1,290 new fellowships because more than 50 percent of the 1965 fellowships had already gone to new or expanded programs. In deciding upon which programs to recommend for approval, the panelists were urged to give highest priority to quality of program. Although applicants were urged not to submit applications for fragments of a generic discipline—e.g., organic chemistry as a part of chemistry, or American history as a part of history—some such applications were received. Panelists were told that, while they should not declare such applications ineligible, they should exercise scrutiny to avoid encouragement of splinter studies resting on insubstantial foundations.

The evaluations of the consultant panels, along with the institutional statements, were reviewed by the Title IV Advisory Committee on February 12, 13, and 14. The 12 Committee members first split up into three groups of four, with a chairman designated for each group, and each group was responsible for making recommendations on one-third of the institutional applications. As a result of the Committee's deliberations during the 3 days, an allocation of the 1,290 additional fellowships to 44 institutions and for awards to students in 421 doctoral programs was approved by the Commissioner of Education. Notification of the new allocations was sent to Members of Congress on February 25, 1965.

The institutions which received supplemental awards are the following, together with the initial award of October 1964, the supplemental award of March 1965, and the total number of fiscal year 1965 awards:

Institutions Receiving Supplemental 1965 Awards ²⁵

State and Institution	Initial allocation of 1965 fellowships	Supplemental allocation of 1965 fellowships	Total number of 1965 fellowships allocated
ARIZONA			
University of Arizona	12	20	32
CALIFORNIA			
California Institute of Technology	4	20	24
Stanford University	21	32	53
University of California, Berkeley	13	30	43
University of California, Los Angeles	18	25	43
COLORADO			
University of Colorado	15	20	35
CONNECTICUT			
Yale University	24	20	44
GEORGIA			
Georgia Institute of Technology	14	20	34
ILLINOIS			
Northwestern University . . .	15	50	65
University of Chicago	27	48	75
University of Illinois	25	40	65
INDIANA			
Indiana University	33	39	72
Purdue University	16	36	52
KANSAS			
University of Kansas	27	24	51
LOUISIANA			
Tulane University	23	20	43
MARYLAND			
Johns Hopkins University . . .	17	32	49
MASSACHUSETTS			
Brandeis University	7	20	27
Harvard University	23	30	53

See footnote at end of table.

Institutions Receiving Supplemental 1965 Awards ²⁵ (continued)

State and Institution	Initial allocation of 1965 fellowships	Supplemental allocation of 1965 fellowships	Total number of 1965 fellowships allocated
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	11	20	31
University of Massachusetts	23	20	43
MICHIGAN			
Michigan State University	18	20	38
University of Michigan	4	48	52
MINNESOTA			
University of Minnesota	28	40	68
MISSOURI			
University of Missouri at Columbia	28	20	48
Washington University	26	35	61
NEW JERSEY			
Princeton University	10	20	30
NEW YORK			
City University of New York	22	20	42
Cornell University	15	20	35
Syracuse University	26	20	46
University of Rochester	25	40	65
NORTH CAROLINA			
Duke University	10	40	50
University of North Carolina	15	40	55
OHIO			
Western Reserve University	16	20	36
OREGON			
University of Oregon	33	42	75
PENNSYLVANIA			
Carnegie Institute of Technology	5	24	29
Pennsylvania State University	17	24	41
University of Pennsylvania	21	28	49
RHODE ISLAND			
Brown University	16	36	52
TENNESSEE			
Vanderbilt University	15	20	35
TEXAS			
Rice University	15	20	35
University of Texas	15	40	55
VIRGINIA			
University of Virginia	15	28	43
WASHINGTON			
University of Washington	17	40	57
WISCONSIN			
University of Wisconsin	36	39	75

²⁵ See appendix A for allocation of fellowships to other institutions for this year as well as for other years.

Restriction Removed Against Award of Fellowships for Study in Classics, Fine Arts, Drama, and Music

During the Senate hearings March 8, 1965, on appropriations for the Office of Education, Commissioner Keppel asked for removal of the restriction imposed in 1961 against award of fellowships in the fields of the classics, fine arts, drama, and music.²⁶ He argued that "studies involving the basic foundations of democracy and Western culture and of such pervasive elements of our society as the fine arts and music are essential to the national welfare."

Interrupting, subcommittee chairman Hill said that the Commissioner had a "good thought there," and he noted the fall of many great nations in the past that had in large measure been due to their failure to fully understand man and his relationships to other men.

On the very next day, March 9, Dr. Ferguson sent out a memorandum, titled "Victory," to all title IV coordinators:

"On Friday last the proposition to reinstate our lost children—the Classics, Fine Arts, Music and even Home Economics—was broached before the Senate Appropriations Committee and no objection was raised. We are about to notify all schools of the event and of the freedom to include such fields in their June applications. Actually the Commissioner is not totally certain how far he will go, but we are hopeful that all the way will not be too far."

On May 5, 1965, Commissioner Keppel sent a memorandum to all title IV coordinators informing them that the prohibition against awards in the fields of the classics, fine arts, drama, and music was under reexamination. He wrote that institutions could now include, on a provisional basis, doctoral programs in these fields in their institutional proposals for 1966-67 fellowships, which were due on or before June 1, 1965. The coordinators were told that, in the event one or more of these fields was determined to be eligible for title IV fellowships, appropriately submitted programs would undergo the standard review procedures.

Commissioner Keppel felt that he had to have the official concurrence of Senator Hill in the removal of the ban against fellowships in the restricted fields, even though the Senator had indicated a sympathetic attitude at the March 8 hearings. This was because it was the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare which had included in the appropriations act for fiscal year 1962 the clause that fellowships would be awarded only in fields which would "insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States."

In his request to Senator Hill, Commissioner Keppel pointed out that the Congress had, in the 1964 amendments, removed from the preamble of NDEA the clause that the act was intended to "correct as rapidly as possible the existing imbalances in our educational programs which have led to an insufficient proportion of our population

²⁶ *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations for 1966*. Hearings Before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. Senate. 89th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965, 228-29.

educated in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages and trained in technology" and had broadened the teacher institute program to include many new fields.

Senator Hill approved the Commissioner's request, and thus the fields of classics, fine arts, drama, music, and home economics became eligible again for fellowships. The prohibition against fellowships in the field of religion, however, remained.

Regional Briefing Sessions on 1964 Title IV Amendments

In March of 1965, Dr. Ferguson resigned as Director of the Graduate Fellowship Branch to accept a position as Program Associate, Educational Division, the Ford Foundation. One of the first actions taken by his acting replacement, Dr. James H. Blessing, was to announce that a series of 1-day meetings were being scheduled across the country to brief university officials on the revisions in policies and criteria governing allocation of title IV support and new application procedures and evaluation processes for academic year 1966-67. These meetings were scheduled to commence in Washington, D.C., on April 14, and be held successively in Atlanta, Chicago, New York, Boston, Kansas City, and, finally, San Francisco on May 1.

Policy on Supplementary Stipends Announced

Contrary to the policy announced in the Commissioner's memorandum of December 22, 1964, Dr. Blessing sent on April 5, 1965, a notification to all title IV coordinators stating that *currently active* fellows were eligible to apply for stipends, and, if pertinent, dependency allowances, for study undertaken between the 1964-65 and 1965-66 academic years. The Commissioner of Education fixed summer stipend and dependency allowances as follows:

Stipend	\$400
Dependency allowance per dependent	\$100

The memorandum stated that these sums would be paid under the following conditions:

- "(1) The recipient must have been actively using an NDEA Title IV fellowship during the Spring Term of the 1964-65 academic year;
- "(2) The recipient must enroll full-time during a term of at least six weeks duration at the institution where his academic-year NDEA Title IV fellowship is held, or must undertake supervised study or dissertation research full-time during the period between the current academic year and the beginning of academic year 1965-66;
- "(3) No recipient must undertake study or dissertation research during the period described in paragraph (2) above which will be directly related to the requirements of the doctoral program in which his Title IV fellowship is held;
- "(4) No partial, nor supplementary, nor retroactive payments will be made;

- "(5) No payment will be made to any Fellow whose name, with supporting data, does not appear on an appropriately certified list of eligibles sent to this office by the Coordinator of NDEA Title IV activities on the Fellow's campus; this form must reach this office by May 1, 1965."

A suggested format to be used in submitting applications for summer stipends was attached to the memorandum. Checks were to be mailed to title IV coordinators in time to pay the students to whom payments were first due. The memorandum stated that it was assumed that no tuition would be charged title IV fellows for the summer session.

Dr. Ferguson Addresses Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research

Speaking no longer as program director of NDEA title IV but as a citizen in the private sector, Dr. Ferguson addressed the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research held in Chicago March 29-30, 1965. It was a very enlightening address explaining the thinking that went into the sweeping policy reforms of NDEA administration.

"To those of us in Washington, who, last year, were charged with developing the plans for implementation of this largest of all direct graduate student support programs," he said, "it was abundantly clear that the old patterns would have to be changed." One major change, he said, "was the placing of the former emphasis of support for new and expanding departments in a definite secondary position." Another was the "decision to move away from the assignment of specific numbers of fellowships to specified doctoral study programs and towards a procedure which would place the awards in the hands of the graduate institutions at large."²⁷

Dr. Ferguson said that in establishing the new policies, the Office of Education had been influenced by the plan of the National Science Foundation for its Science Development Program and noted the similarity between the NDEA title IV application procedures and those of that program. He stated that the principal focus of the title IV program in the future would be on support of excellence in graduate education.²⁸ While admitting that such a policy would "result in the relatively strong getting stronger," he thought that this was "healthy and [would] do far more for the national welfare than a promiscuous scattering of Federal funds."

Dr. Ferguson said that he envisioned some of the larger graduate schools receiving from 150 to 200 new fellowships per year and, considering that the fellowships were 3-year awards, the institutions in the future might have from 450 to 600 fellows on campus at one time if Congress appropriated funds up to the full authorization. He stated that

²⁷ Alan D. Ferguson. "Federal Support of Graduate Education." In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Meeting of the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research*. Athens: Ohio University, 1965. pp. 46-52.

²⁸ As a matter of fact, the centers-of-excellence concept was never really implemented in the title IV program.

an institution with such a number of title IV fellows would receive from \$1,125,000 to \$1,500,000 institutional support money each year. "At some institutions," he said, "this program will now buy many years of time in the development of their graduate education activities. And none can doubt its continuance into the far future—and its probable expansion again. I do not believe I am exaggerating . . . when I say that this single source of Federal support for graduate education will, in the course of a decade, prove to be a major—if not the major—determinant in the development of that education for a generation beyond."

Dr. Ferguson regarded the problem of selectivity as difficult: "In all candor I must admit that the solution to the problem of selectivity is not yet clear. I believe it will take from three to five years of experience to see the most useful and most equitable pattern clearly. At this time, however, the plan of action is to operate flexibly along these lines—to give support to the strongest institutions in a measure which will help assure maximum student enrollment at the pre-doctoral level, to give support to a much larger number of second echelon institutions in such measure that they will have a major opportunity to maintain and develop their doctoral programs at a level of excellence across a broad spectrum of disciplines, and to give support to the remaining institutions in whatever proportion they can demonstrate excellence or potential excellence in their pre-doctoral work. We believe that when this fellowship program hits its full stride in 1967-68, there will be enough money available to satisfy these three segments of a distribution pattern. The range of support will run from a minimum of 4 awards per institution to a maximum of from 150 to 200."

Dr. Ferguson hailed two important changes authorized by Congress. One was the freeing of the fellowships from the shackles of being limited to the support of studies in the years immediately following the baccalaureate degree. The second was the provision for support beyond the normal academic-year period. To these was added a ground rule that the awardee could use the grant during any of the first 5 years of postbaccalaureate study for the doctorate, a rule which Dr. Ferguson said would "do much to establish a 5-year pattern for degree completion."²⁹ Dr. Ferguson expressed the hope that institutions would see the wisdom of using their own resources to support students for periods of study not covered by fellowships.

Institutional Reaction to New NDEA Policies

In his speech to the Midwest Conference on Graduate Study and Research, Dr. Ferguson said that there were "few complaints about recent Title IV decisions." However, Dr. Blessing, who served as Acting Program Director from March through June of 1965, and Dr. Preston Valien, who

²⁹ The 5-year pattern involving the use of NDEA fellowships was never put into practice as a matter of policy. Administrative and budgetary problems that would be occasioned by large, unpredictable numbers of fellows on interruption of tenure made the plan impractical to administer.

became Director on July 1, 1965, stated that the Office of Education received a number of complaints about the new directions the program had taken. These complaints came from the less prestigious institutions which had been more or less favored under the previous policies of the NDEA program. They felt that they were losing out under the new policies, which they believed were in violation of the purpose and intent of the title IV program as originally conceived by the Congress. On the other hand, the new policies were warmly applauded by the major graduate schools which felt that they had been discriminated against in the past. They believed themselves to have greater capacity and ability to produce the high-quality college teachers intended by the act.

Perhaps the reasons that Dr. Ferguson was able to say in March that few complaints had been received, whereas Dr. Blessing in the spring of 1965 and Dr. Valien in the summer of 1965 said that a number of them had been received, were: (1) that the announcement of the selective allocation among 44 institutions of the remaining 1,290 fellowships of the 3,000 authorized to be awarded in fiscal year 1965 had not been released until late in February and (2) that the full impact of the intended new directions of the title IV program had not become completely evident until Dr. Ferguson made his candid address at the Midwest Conference.

With the announcement in September 1965 of the allocation of the 6,000 new fellowships for academic year 1966-67, opposition to the new policies subsided. Dissident institutions began to realize that, with the vastly increased numbers of fellowships, they would not be short-changed but in most cases substantially aided.

Panelists Review Fellowship Applications for 1966-67

By the closeout date of June 1, 1965, a total of 187 institutions had submitted applications for the 6,000 fellowships authorized to commence in the fall of 1966. The procedure followed was the same as that utilized in the winter 1965 competition for fall 1965 fellowships, with panels of consultants first evaluating applications by departments. However, whereas 36 consultants had been employed in the winter of 1965, 72 were used at the panelist meetings convened at the Office of Education on June 16, 17, and 18 of 1965. This increased number was necessary because of the expansion from 3,000 to 6,000 in the number of fellowships to be allocated, the increase in the number of institutional applications from 160 to 187, and the greater length of institutional applications resulting from the request for more detailed information.

The panelists were assigned to six academic area groupings according to their competency: biological sciences; education; engineering; humanities; physical sciences; and social sciences. Each departmental program received at least two ratings, with the principal items rated being: (1) present quality, (2) prospective quality, (3) soundness of expansion pattern, and (4) appropriateness of anticipated amount of title IV assistance. These ratings were then as-

sembled for review at the next meeting of the Title IV Advisory Committee meeting to be held on July 7, 8, and 9 of 1965.

Organizational Changes

With Public Law 88-665 vastly expanding the graduate fellowship program, it was necessary to considerably increase the staff and make organizational changes to cope with the expansion. The existing staff numbered only nine. As mentioned earlier, Congress had, in a supplemental appropriation, authorized 20 new positions for the program. In order to provide services necessary for the smooth operation of the Graduate Fellowship Branch, three sections were created. These were the Program Services Section, Program Analysis Section, and Program Operations Section. The Assistant Director of the Graduate Fellowship Branch was placed in charge of the Program Operations Section, which was to be staffed by six regional coordinators and supporting personnel.³⁰

³⁰ Two regional coordinator positions were filled in the spring of 1965. In the remaining years covered by this 10-year report, the number of regional coordinators never exceeded five at any one time.

The professional positions designated as regional coordinators were established because the program had expanded so much that the Director and his assistant could no longer handle the professional responsibilities by themselves. The function of the regional coordinator is to provide liaison between the Graduate Fellowship Branch and institutions participating in the title IV program. These staff associates are charged both with Branch administrative responsibilities and field contacts with respect to institutions in specific geographic regions. The field activities of the regional coordinator consist essentially of communication with participating institutions. This includes reporting to the institutions on program developments, explaining the rationale for fellowship allocations, and providing information on program appraisals. The regional coordinators confer with administrative officers, departmental chairmen, and NDEA title IV fellows concerning program objectives and operation.

Until 1965 official records on institutions and fellows were maintained only in the Branch's files, but starting in July of 1965 such records were transferred to computer tapes for permanent recordkeeping and future data analysis.

CHAPTER X

eighth year of operation

The Office of Education underwent another reorganization on July 1, 1965. The Bureau of Educational Assistance Programs, in which the Graduate Fellowship Branch had been located, was abolished, and the Graduate Fellowship Branch was transferred to the newly created Bureau of Higher Education where it was renamed the Program Support Branch in the Division of Graduate Programs.

Preston Valien, a sociologist who had come to the Office of Education in the winter of 1965 from Brooklyn College as Chief of the Program Analysis Section of the Graduate Facilities Branch, took over as Director of the Program Support Branch on July 1, 1965. Understandably, Dr. Valien did not like the name change from Graduate Fellowship Branch to Program Support Branch, and one of his goals was to get the name changed to one more appropriate. The reason the name had been changed was that, in the reorganization of July 1, 1965, each division was required to have a program support branch, and in the Division of Graduate Programs, the Graduate Fellowship Branch was selected as the one to bear the name. After a couple of

months, Dr. Valien succeeded in getting the name changed to Graduate Academic Programs Branch. This name was chosen because it was anticipated that the Branch's future responsibilities might include more than just fellowship programs.

When Dr. Valien took over on July 1, 1965, as head of the Graduate Fellowship Program, he assumed the existing title of Director. Later, around the end of 1965, with an Office of Education reclassification of position titles, the title of Director was changed back to that of Chief.

Advisory Committee Meeting of July 7-9, 1965

The Title IV Advisory Committee convened July 7-9 to review the evaluations of the consultant panels that had met during the previous month. Using the same procedures followed in February of 1965, the Committee commenced its work by splitting up into three groups, with a chairman for each group. The review workload was divided into approximately three equal parts. Taking into account the

panelist's evaluations of individual departmental programs and the group's own evaluation of each institution's graduate program as revealed through its institutional statement, each group arrived at a recommended number of fellowships which it presented to the Advisory Committee meeting as a whole at the final session on July 9.

John W. Ashton, who had come in early February of 1965 on leave from his position as Vice President and Graduate Dean at Indiana University to serve for a year as Director of the Division of Graduate Programs, opened the final session of the Committee meeting. He said that the Committee's recommendations at that session "would represent major program support for graduate work in the future." This was because of the commitment (subject to congressional appropriations and satisfactory progress of programs) to guarantee for fall 1967 and fall 1968 three-fourths of the number of fellowships awarded to begin in the fall of 1966.

Although at first there had been some hope that the Office of Education would be able to award an average of four fellowships per approved program, it soon became apparent that the number of programs approved by the panelists—over 2,000 of them—would make this goal impossible, with 6,000 fellowships to allocate.

The total number of fellowships recommended by the three groups exceeded 6,000, making some cutting necessary. One major institution had been recommended for as many as 146 fellowships and a number of other institutions had been recommended for over 100. It was decided that the effect of cutting back on the fellowships would hurt the middle-size and small institutions more than the large institutions; therefore, a maximum of 95 fellowships for any one institution was established. Twenty-five institutions were cut back in their allocations as a result of this action. No approved institution received an allocation of fewer than four fellowships. The Advisory Committee recommended that the announcement of allocations to institutions should include a statement emphasizing the desire of the Office of Education to increase support of non-science fields.

At the request of Committee member Dean Harold Howe of St. Louis University, head of the title IV program in 1961-62, the letter of July 2, 1965, from Gustav O. Arlt, President of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, to seven graduate deans, was discussed. In his letter, Dr. Arlt referred to the large expansion in the NDEA fellowship program and warned that "unless some steps are taken very quickly to establish ground rules for the awarding of these fellowships, we will face a period of six months of uncontrolled competition." He asked Dean Howe to serve as chairman of a committee to do the following:

1. Establish a date before which no NDEA fellowship for 1966-67 might be offered.
2. Revise the wording of the April 15 rule so as to make it clear that an acceptance in force after that date would constitute a legal and moral commitment on the part of the student.

3. Devise a rule to the effect that any offer made after April 15 would stipulate that the student could not accept it until he submitted a release in writing from the dean of the institution to which he was already committed.

4. Discuss and make recommendations on the possibility of establishing a uniform date (April 1 or other) for offering all nonservice awards.

The Arlt letter was thoroughly discussed by Title IV Advisory Committee members but no consensus was reached with regard to the four points raised in the letter. For one thing, it was pointed out that the Office of Education would have no control over the awarding of fellowships which were not NDEA-sponsored. It was agreed that it would be better to achieve voluntary compliance through mutual agreement among the members of such an organization as the Council of Graduate Schools of the United States.

Although no recommendation in regard to the Arlt letter was made by the Committee, Dean Howe expressed appreciation for the helpful, informative discussion.

Congress Notified of Fellowship Allocations for 1966-67

On November 8, 1965, Members of Congress were notified of the allocation of the 6,000 new NDEA title IV graduate fellowships to be awarded for study beginning in the 1966-67 academic year. The allocation involved 172 institutions (20 more than in 1965-66) for use in a total of 2,060 approved departments or interdepartmental programs (an increase of 1,150, or 126 percent, over the 910 approved for the 1965-66 year). The selected institutions were located in the District of Columbia and every State except Alaska (from which no application was received). The notification stated that the Office of Education was making a commitment (subject to congressional appropriation of funds and to evidence of satisfactory progress in carrying out the approved graduate study programs) to allocate to the same institutions in each of the next two years a number of additional fellowships which would be not less than 75 percent of the number allocated for initial use in 1966-67.

Applicants Informed of Competition Results

On November 10, 2 days after the notification to Members of Congress, Dr. Valien sent a letter to each applying institution informing it of the results of the competition for 1966-67 fellowships.

In addition to outlining the new commitment for additional 3-year fellowships, the letter urged each institution to select nominees in areas of study in which there were few, if any, alternate sources of graduate student assistance. Dr. Valien wrote that it was the hope of the Office of Education that participating institutions would, as a group, be able to assign two-thirds or more of their NDEA fellowships to departments outside of the natural sciences and engineering fields.

The letter further stated that the procedures for nominating students would be essentially the same as those

practiced during the preceding year and that a new Coordinator's Manual was in preparation. Meanwhile, the memorandum of December 22, 1964, entitled "General Policies for NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program and Instructions for Applying for Allocations of Fellowships" still served as a general statement of policies and procedures.

Dr. Valien's letter notified institutions of one small change which had been made in the governing of awards of fellowships. While it was still required that at least 75 percent of the awards go to beginning students, the Office of Education was readopting its former definition of a beginning student: viz., one who at the time the fellowship became effective, had completed no more than one-half year of graduate study creditable toward the doctorate to be awarded upon successful completion of his course of study in the approved program.

Memorandum on Vacated Fellowships Sent to Coordinators

On March 3, 1966, Dr. Valien sent to each title IV coordinator a memorandum concerning vacated fellowships which, as of February 23, 1966, had at least one full year of unused tenure remaining. Accompanying each memorandum was a list of all the vacated fellowships at his institution, with the number of years of tenure remaining for each. Dr. Valien reviewed the conditions governing the reaward of vacated fellowships and requested that nominations be sent to the Office of Education by May 8, 1966.

Advisory Committee Meeting of March 15, 1966

The Title IV Advisory Committee met on March 15, 1966, for the second time during the 1966 fiscal year. The purpose of the meeting was to establish priorities for the allocation of 1967-68 fellowships and consider three proposed policy changes in regard to: (1) outside supplementation of stipends; (2) limitation on teaching and research assistantships; and (3) the percent of new fellowships which were required to go to beginning graduate students (i.e., students who had completed no more than one-half year of graduate study creditable toward their doctorates).

In regard to establishment of allocation priorities for 1967-68 fellowships, the Committee was told that because of budgetary pressures due to the Vietnam war, the Bureau of the Budget had allowed only 6,000 new fellowships to be allocated for the 1967-68 year rather than the 7,500 requested by the Office of Education. Since institutions had been promised that they would receive for 1967-68 at least 75 percent of the number of fellowships they received for 1966-67, only 1,500 of the 6,000 new fellowships expected to be available for 1967-68 were, in actuality, un earmarked. The Committee was asked to set some priorities for their distribution. The following priorities were agreed upon:

First Priority

All institutions which had received 25 or fewer fellowships for 1966-67 would receive at least that many for 1967-68.

Second Priority

Institutions which had received more than 25 fellowships for 1966-67 would receive at least three-quarters that many, except that none of these institutions would receive fewer than 25 fellowships.

Third Priority

Appropriate numbers of new fellowships would be allocated to institutions being awarded fellowships for the first time. Such institutions were to be promised, subject to congressional appropriation of funds and satisfactory progress in the development of their doctoral programs, a commitment to allocate to the institution additional three-year fellowships for 1968-69 equal to the three-quarters of the number allocated for 1967-68.

Fourth Priority

The remainder of the fellowships were to be distributed among the participating institutions in proportion to the distribution for 1966-67, except for institutions which qualified for extra assistance through the approval of additional departments, or which demonstrated, either in the required progress reports or by means of a special supplemental request, that they should receive a greater degree of title IV assistance for 1967-68 than they received for 1966-67.

The following three policy changes were accepted:

"1. *Outside Supplementation of Title IV Stipends.* An institution may supplement a Fellow's stipend by an amount not to exceed \$1,000 per year while he is engaged in teaching or research assigned by his department as part of his training (see item 2). A Fellow may not hold another Federal award during his tenure as an NDEA Fellow. The amount and purpose of any other stipendiary assistance received during periods of fellowship tenure must be reported by the Fellow to the Office of Education.

"2. *Limitation on Teaching and Research Assistantships.* A Fellow must devote full time to required study or research during each year of fellowship tenure. He may not engage in gainful employment except as outlined below. Because a reasonable amount of teaching and research constitutes a valuable part of the graduate training of college and university teachers, a Fellow may engage in such teaching, research, or similar activities as are in his institution's opinion contributory to such training. Institutions are expected to compensate Fellows for such activities at the same rate paid other graduate students for comparable activities. However, Fellows may not receive more than \$1,000 per year for such services nor may they be given teaching assignments during their first year of tenure as NDEA Fellows.

"3. *Distribution of Fellowships Between Beginning and Advanced Graduate Students.* One half of an institution's new NDEA fellowships must be awarded to beginning graduate students."

The policy change in regard to outside supplementation of title IV stipends was occasioned by complaints that some institutions, especially those with substantial funds, had been taking unfair advantage of other institutions in the competition for top graduate students by offering them

large supplementation to their title IV stipends. The new policy of a maximum of \$1,000 supplementation was created to control such practices.

Although the Advisory Committee had recommended that one-half of an institution's new NDEA fellowships had to be awarded to beginning graduate students, it was decided a few days later at a meeting with the Commissioner of Education to change the one-half to two-thirds.

Application and Progress Report Forms Sent to Institutions

On April 20, application and progress report forms pertaining to fellowships for 1967-68 were mailed to all institutions with doctoral programs, including those institutions which had not received an allocation of NDEA title IV fellowships for the 1966-67 year. The forms had to be submitted or postmarked no later than May 28, 1966.

The application forms requested that institutions which had not received fellowships for 1966-67 submit a narrative of unspecified length similar to the one requested of all applicants the previous year. In this general narrative the applicant was asked to give details on 16 items of the institution's total development of its doctoral training program and of its plan for each of the next five years, giving emphasis to those parts of the total program for which fellowship support was being requested.

Institutions which had received 1966-67 fellowships were not required to resubmit a general institutional narrative, even if they were requesting a larger number of fellowships than the minimum committed to them. They were informed, however, that they could submit this statement if they felt that it would engender more favorable consideration for their requests. It was asked that this statement be a considerably abridged version of the one submitted the previous year and that it present clearly and cogently those elements which they believed would warrant a greater degree of title IV assistance for 1967-68. This statement was to be a self-contained presentation not requiring reference to the previous year's submission.

All departments or comparable units which were not approved in 1966-67 but which sought approval for 1967-68, whether in newly applying institutions or in institutions already participating, were required to provide detailed information about the department's faculty, strengths, and plans. This was similar to the type of information required in the application for 1966-67 fellowships. A statement, of

lesser length and detail, which in effect was a progress report, was required of departments and comparable units which had gained program approval for 1966-67. This progress report requested information on new faculty, faculty which had been lost to the program, and any curriculum, administrative, or physical changes of major significance that had occurred during the year.

All departments and comparable units, whether seeking new approval or continuing approval, were asked to respond to the following three new items which had been incorporated into the original outline for the preparation of departmental applications:

"Describe what the department (or other academic unit) has done or plans to do to ensure that Title IV fellowships succeed in their purpose of helping Fellows to complete their doctorates within not more than five full years of graduate study.

"Describe any steps which the department (or other academic unit) has taken or plans to take to provide teaching experience for Title IV fellows to prepare them for careers as college and university teachers.

"Describe any steps which the department (or other academic unit) has taken or plans to take to keep track of the careers of Title IV Fellows after they leave the institution."

Panelists Convene to Review New Applications and Progress Reports

Eighty consultant panelists, the largest number in the history of the program, convened in the Office of Education on June 15, 16, and 17 to evaluate 2,047 progress reports on ongoing departmental programs as well as 1,067 applications of departments, and comparable units, seeking first-time approval.

As in the previous year, panelists were instructed to give highest priority to the quality of the graduate program. In the case of ongoing programs they were asked to be alert to cases in which academic departments were unable to sustain the quality of the program because of a major loss of personnel or a lack of continued and adequate support for the program and for title IV fellows.

For the purpose of the evaluation, the 80-member panel was subdivided into 25 panels representing various major subacademic areas or their combinations. A chairman was designated for each panel, which usually consisted of three members.

CHAPTER XI

ninth year of operation

John W. Ashton returned to Indiana University after serving a year as Director of the Division of Graduate Programs. He was succeeded in that capacity on July 1, 1966, by Preston Valien who was promoted from his position as Chief of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch. Dr. Valien was in turn succeeded by Richard L. Predmore, who came to the Office as Chief of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch on 1 year's leave of absence from his position as Dean of the Graduate School and Vice Provost of Duke University.¹

Quality of Graduate Education Discussed

A study that evoked considerable interest in graduate circles was *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education*,

¹ Dean Predmore was assisted by George B. Lane, a former regional coordinator, who in May of 1966 replaced James H. Blessing. Dr. Blessing left the Branch to become Director of the Division of Fellowships and Stipends, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

by Allan M. Cartter, Vice President of the American Council on Education. Because the NDEA Graduate Fellowship Program had during the preceding couple of years been giving added emphasis to quality when considering support of graduate programs, the Branch was particularly interested in the recently published Council's report. For that reason Dr. Cartter, at the invitation of Dr. Valien, met with the Branch staff members on July 13, 1966, to discuss the methodology and some of the implications of the study.

The Cartter study grew out of a desire from several quarters for a qualitative ranking of graduate schools. Dr. Cartter said that two particular weaknesses of the study were the necessary degree of uncertainty involved in a study based on subjective opinion, albeit informed opinion, and the time lag separating the information which the raters used and the publication of the report. He felt that these led to a rating of schools on the reputations of their "luminaries" only, resulting in judgments geared more to a school's past than its future and tending to ignore what he referred to as "secondary strength."

Dr. Cartter directed the major part of his remarks to the first chapter of the report. He explained the basis for his prediction of an oversupply of college teachers in the near future, and the reasons for the differences in the statistics of the Council and those of the Office of Education. In particular, he cited the Office of Education's use of 6 percent as the estimated replacement rate necessary for college and university teachers; he cited 2 percent as a more realistic estimate of the replacement need.

Questions were raised by members of the Branch as to whether Dr. Cartter, in making his prediction of an oversupply of college teachers holding Ph. D.'s, had taken into account the increased demand for Ph. D.'s in junior colleges, decreased teaching loads, and the growing trend toward postdoctoral study.

Advisory Committee Meeting of July 20-22, 1966

The Title IV Advisory Committee met on July 20, 21, and 22 to rate the institutional portion of the title IV applications and to review the evaluations made by panelists for each separate academic program application submitted by an institution. As in the previous year, the Committee broke up into subgroups representing various geographic regions. Each subgroup was asked to recommend to a plenary session of the Advisory Committee an allocation of fellowships for each institution in its region.

Before proceeding to the allocation of fellowships for 1967-68, the Advisory Committee considered two policy matters. One concerned the request from the Association of American Law Schools to revise NDEA title IV regulations to allow for the support of law students. The Committee accepted the recommendation that a program leading toward any law degree beyond the first law degree—providing the intention of the program was to train teachers and required 3 years of study with a research dissertation—be eligible for support.

The other policy question dealt with the recent legislation (to be effective July 1967) concerning the liberalization of public access to unclassified documents. If this proposed freedom-of-information law was passed (it was), it was foreseen that the Office of Education might be asked to make public the names of panelists who evaluated departmental applications. There was no problem with the Title IV Advisory Committee because the names of its members had always been available to anyone. The names, in fact, had frequently appeared in various publications. In the case of the panelists, however, it was felt that their effectiveness would be impaired if the confidentiality of their evaluations was compromised, and, indeed, many persons would refuse to serve as panelists under such circumstances. In order to prevent any future difficulties in implementing the Office of Education's programs, the Commissioner of Education had prepared a letter to higher authority requesting that panelists' names be exempt from coverage under the proposed legislation. The Advisory Committee unanimously applauded this action by the Commissioner.

After disposing of policy questions, the Committee proceeded to consider the recommendations of the subgroups on allocation of the fellowships. After some discussion, it was agreed that a ceiling of 85 fellowships be established for any one institution. The previous year's ceiling had been 95, with the same number—6,000—of new fellowships to be allocated. An important reason for the cut was that 193 institutions had been approved for fellowships for 1967-68 compared to 172 for 1966-67. Also, the small- and medium-size institutions were cut less, proportionately, than the large institutions. A drastic cut would, of course, have imposed a more severe impact on the smaller institutions.

Dean Predmore announced that, beginning with the academic year 1966-67, a new procedure with respect to payment of stipends, dependency allowances, and educational assistance grants to institutions would be established. The procedure would be a "Letter of Credit" system, already in operation in a number of Federal agencies, whereby institutions could periodically draw upon funds, in specified amounts, to make necessary payments. This meant that, instead of the Office of Education making payment to the fellows, in the future the institutions would make the payments. One Advisory Committee member felt that this new procedure would place an overhead cost burden upon the institutions, but the consensus was that the new procedure was acceptable in view of the fact that the numbers of fellows being supported had grown so large that the Graduate Academic Programs Branch could no longer efficiently process the payments.

Notification of New Method of Payment to Title IV Fellows Announced

On August 12, Dean Predmore stated in a memorandum to all graduate deans, title IV coordinators, and business officers of participating institutions that the graduate fellowship program was introducing a new method of payment to NDEA title IV fellows and institutions. Addressees were told that on September 1, 1966, payments would be made under the funding system of the National Institutes of Health, a component of HEW, to which would be transferred amounts of money to be authorized for each institution. The amounts would include sufficient funds to cover the educational assistance grant and the stipend and dependency entitlement for each of the active fellows during the 1966-67 academic year. This money was to be released in approximately three equal amounts on September 1, 1966, December 1, 1966, and March 1, 1967. It did not include funds for stipends and allowances for the summer of 1967. This was to be taken care of later.

The memorandum stated that the division of responsibility for the administration of the new funding system between the title IV coordinator and the finance officer was a matter to be determined by each institution. The memorandum specified, however, certain basic responsibilities which the Office of Education believed should be assigned to each.

Payment to Individual Fellows

The Office of Education gave wide latitude to institutions in the method of payment to individual fellows; however, all institutions had to base their method of payment on the following:

1. First-year fellows were to be paid stipends at a rate of \$2,000 per academic year (\$200 per month for a 10-month period).
2. Second-year fellows were to be paid stipends at a rate of \$2,200 per academic year (\$220 per month for a 10-month period).
3. Third-year fellows were to be paid stipends at a rate of \$2,400 per academic year (\$240 per month for a 10-month period).
4. Dependency allowances were to be paid at the rate of \$400 per dependent per academic year (\$40 per month for a 10-month period). Changes in the number of dependents during the year, however, would result in appropriate changes in the total yearly payment.

Timing and Mode of Payments

The timing of payments to fellows was left to the discretion of each institution, except that there could be no less than two payments per academic year and institutions were responsible for recovering any payments made in excess of entitlement to students who dropped out of school before the end of the academic year. Payment was to be by check and no part of the amount due was to be withheld for any purpose.

Acquisition of Entitlement by Fellows

Fellows acquired provisional entitlement to stipends (and dependency allowances) on a month-by-month basis over a period of 10 months beginning September 1. Actual entitlement was acquired after the 14th day of each month, except that no entitlement was acquired until the fellow had registered for the academic year and completed the first 14 days. When the final month of the official academic year for a given institution did not contain 14 days, entitlement for that month was to be based on the number of days of that month included in the academic year. Entitlement to whatever portion of a stipend remained unpaid in institutions whose academic year closed before June was to be based on completion of the final month of the official academic year.

Institutions were not required to pay fellows in 10 installments nor were they under obligation to pay at registration time. Institutions could use title IV funds to advance money to fellows, but they were responsible for recovering overpayments to fellows who did not remain long enough to establish entitlement to the amounts received. However, no more than half of the fellow's annual stipend and dependency allowances could be advanced before December 1.

Dependency Payments

Entitlement to dependency allowances was to be on the same basis as entitlement to stipends, except that a dependent gained within any given month would increase the fellow's provisional entitlement by \$40 on the first of the following month. A dependent lost within any given month would reduce the fellow's provisional entitlement by \$40 on the first of the following month. Each fellow, continuing as well as new, was required to execute a new Application for Dependency Allowances certifying to the legitimacy of the dependency allowance request.

Conference on Personnel Needs of Junior and Four-Year Colleges

It was anticipated that the 90th Congress, convening in January of 1967, would, in addition to extending and improving title IV, consider legislation to train personnel of less than Ph. D. qualifications to serve primarily in junior colleges and in the lower divisions of four-year colleges. With this in mind, the Division of Graduate Programs convened at the Office of Education on September 19, 1966, a small conference of about 30 graduate deans, presidents and deans of undergraduate colleges, and representatives of appropriate national associations and foundations. It was hoped that discussion between producers and employers of college teachers would be valuable to both and that it might enable the Office of Education to discover new ways of helping to overcome the critical shortage of teachers in junior and 4-year colleges. The conference was chaired by Dean Predmore. Division Director Valien participated during the entire conference and Associate Commissioner of Higher Education Peter Muirhead and Commissioner Harold Howe made brief presentations.

The morning session was devoted to a description of existing programs for training these types of personnel. The afternoon session was devoted to a discussion of the problem of training sufficient numbers of teachers and the kind of training they should receive. No set formula was devised at this time. Rather, because of the complexity of the problem, a diversity of approaches was recommended. In summarizing the conference, Dr. Valien identified the following possibilities of Federal support for training for undergraduate teaching:

1. Inauguration of a new federally sponsored undergraduate College Teaching Fellowship Program including support for teaching assistantships under the supervision of master college teachers.
2. Establishment of a College Teaching Development Program to provide institutional aid to colleges and universities for the development of undergraduate college teaching programs.
3. A program encompassing institutes and workshops to provide upgrading and refresher courses for experienced teachers in community and 4-year colleges.

4. New training programs for teachers of postsecondary vocational and occupational subjects.

It is interesting to observe that part E, Training Programs for Higher Education Personnel, Education Professions Development Act, Public Law 90-35, signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson on June 29, 1967, embodied many of the ideas proposed at this conference.

Southern Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities Passes Resolution on Title IV Fellowship Distribution

At its annual meeting in Lexington, Ky., on October 4, 1966, the Southern Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities passed the following resolution deploring the decreasing percentage of NDEA title IV fellowships awarded to southern institutions:

"Whereas statistics show that while the number of NDEA Title IV fellowships has increased over the past eight years from 1000 to 6000, the percentage awarded to Southern institutions, both public and private, has decreased from 36 per cent to 23 per cent; and whereas this trend seems to be in direct opposition to the original philosophy of the National Defense Education Act, resulting in essential inequity and injury in Southern institutions; therefore, be it resolved that:

"The Southern Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities assembled at Lexington, Kentucky, October 4, 1966, expresses its conviction that a more equitable geographical distribution should be forthcoming, and recommends that the total allocations to all institutions in any state should not be less than one-half of the number which would be awarded on a fractional population basis."

The Resolutions Committee recommended that a copy of this resolution be furnished the president of each institution in the Association, with the request that it be sent to each Congressman representing his State, accompanied by a personal letter asking support for an amendment to the National Defense Education Act which would result in an increased percentage of fellowships being awarded to the southern region.

As was to be expected, a number of inquiries concerning the resolution was received by the Office of Education during the fall of 1966 from Members of Congress representing southern states. The Office of Education position in regard to these inquiries was that, while the percentages stated in the Southern Association resolution were accurate, the South received 23 percent of 6,000, or 1,380 fellowships in 1966-67, while it received 36 percent of 1,500, or 540 fellowships in 1959-60. The Office's replies pointed out that when the title IV program commenced in 1959-60, the emphasis was on new and expanded programs, and in this context the South did very well. With the expansion to 6,000 fellowships, the emphasis changed to utilization of underused capacity wherever it existed. This meant that many major graduate institutions, with long-established programs in graduate education, began to participate very

significantly in the title IV program whereas previously they had been involved in it in only a minor way. The replies also stated that, in spite of the percentage decrease in the number of fellowships, the South was continuing to receive a more favorable proportion of fellowships in relation to the number of Ph. D.'s it produced than any other region of the country.

Senator Lausche Objects to a Title IV Award

On October 17, 1966, Senator Frank Lausche, Democrat of Ohio, received consent to have inserted into the *Congressional Record* an article written by Edward J. Mowery with respect to a 3-year title IV fellowship awarded in July of 1966 to Richard Erle Healey for graduate study in mathematics at Tulane University. In his brief remarks before the Senate concerning Mr. Mowery's article, Senator Lausche asserted:

"In my opinion the background of this man, if supported by the facts as related by Mr. Mowery, are of such character as not to warrant granting him a fellowship, if the continued faith and confidence of the American people is to be kept in the services which are being rendered through largesse of this kind by the Department of Education."²

The article by Mr. Mowery declared that Mr. Healey, a graduate of Reed College, Portland, Ore., was "the son of Dorothy Healey, Chairman and leading spokesman of the Southern California Communist Party and reportedly a member of the Party's national committee." Among other things, the article charged that Mr. Healey had attended in 1962 in Helsinki, Finland, the World Youth Festival sponsored by the World Federation of Democratic Youth, which had been cited as a communist organization by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

In the way of background, the Office of Education, upon receiving and reviewing the application of Mr. Healey for a fellowship in the spring of 1966, had informed him that it was denying his request. As permitted by regulations, Mr. Healey chose to appeal the denial. His appeal was reviewed in Washington on April 16, 1966, by the seven-member Fellowship Review Panel whose chairman was Michael H. Cardozo, Executive Director of the Association of American Law Schools. Lawrence Speiser, head of the District of Columbia branch of the American Civil Liberties Union, appeared as counsel for Mr. Healey. After hearing the case, the Panel recommended approval of the fellowship award to Mr. Healey.

Allocation of Fellowships for 1967-68 Announced

On November 13, 1966, Members of Congress were notified of the allocation of 6,000 new NDEA title IV fellowships to 193 institutions of higher education for the 1967-68 academic year. The fellowships were available for use in 2,692 approved programs in participating institutions lo-

² *Congressional Record*, Vol. 112, Part 20, 89th Congress, 2d Session, October 17, 1966, p. 27231.

cated in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Forty-three percent of the approved programs were in the humanities, social sciences, and education; 57 percent were in the biological sciences, physical sciences, and engineering.

Two days later, on November 15, a letter was sent to each institution which had applied for 1967-68 fellowships. For institutions with one or more approved programs, a list of the approved programs in which the fellowships could be used was appended; asterisks marked programs approved for the first time. The letter stated that, despite legislative authorization for 7,500 fellowships in 1967-68, only 6,000 new awards were funded. As a result, it was explained, no substantial increases beyond the minimum commitment could be made to most institutions, although special consideration was accorded those demonstrating particular promise and achievement in the annual progress reports made during the previous spring.

The letter reaffirmed the recommendation that NDEA title IV fellowships be assigned predominately to fields outside the natural sciences and engineering, insofar as possible. The actual distribution of the fellowships among the approved programs was left to the discretion of the institutions, but it was the intent of the Office of Education that two-thirds or more of the awards be made to students in the humanities, social sciences, and education, where alternative sources of Federal support were less available; the NDEA title IV program was the only Federal predoctoral fellowship authority to provide noncategorical support within the humanities and fine arts. Institutions were urged to the extent possible to comply with, or surpass, this request.

Advisory Committee Meeting of November 15-16, 1966

The 1964 amendments to NDEA extended the authorization of the graduate fellowship program until June 30, 1968. Therefore, there was the likelihood that, with the beginning of the 90th Congress in January of 1967, there would be consideration given to its possible extension and amendment. Hence, it was considered desirable to convene the Advisory Committee to discuss how well the program was going and what possible improvements might be suggested. The Committee met at the Office of Education for a two-day session—November 15 and 16. Dean Predmore chaired the meeting. Dr. Valien, Director of the Division of Graduate Programs, attended during most of the session, and Commissioner of Education Howe and Associate Commissioner for Higher Education Muirhead met briefly with the Committee.

As a result of thorough discussion of all facets of the graduate fellowship program and its relationship to the development of graduate education in the United States, the Committee arrived at a consensus as follows:

1. The title IV program was doing a good job in meeting

the congressional intent of producing college teachers, and Congress should authorize continuation of the program. The focus on preparation of college teachers should be retained and the scope not broadened to include other purposes.

2. The emphasis on Ph. D. or equivalent degrees should be retained. Although there was recognition of the growing need for junior college teachers, it was felt that the training of such persons could be better achieved by legislation separate from title IV of NDEA.

3. In spite of the Cartter report, there was the belief on the part of the Title IV Advisory Committee, because of rapidly growing college enrollments, that there would be a shortage of well qualified college teachers for the foreseeable future. The Committee therefore recommended a 5-year extension of the title IV program. It also recommended that the Congress authorize an expansion beyond the current ceiling of 7,500 new fellowships annually to 10,000, then 12,000, and, finally, 15,000 during the last 3 years.

4. Institutions should be informed that new policy required placing additional stress on making teaching experience an integral part of their programs. Such teaching, however, was to be so limited that NDEA fellows would clearly remain full-time students. Teaching should continue to be limited to the second and third years of tenure as NDEA fellows, and the ceiling of \$1,000 per year supplementation of a fellow's stipend for teaching or research assigned by the fellow's department should be retained.

At this Advisory Committee meeting, Dr. Valien revealed that the Office of Education had been seriously considering recommending that Congress authorize a fourth-year NDEA fellowship in cases where such fellowships would be desirable. Institutions, he said, might be encouraged to develop a 5-year package in which, for example, a student might be on an NDEA fellowship the first 2 years, spend a year as a teaching assistant, then go back on an NDEA fellowship the fourth and fifth years.

Council of Graduate Schools Urges Congress to Restore Budget Cut and Extend NDEA

At its Sixth Annual Meeting in Denver, Colo., in December of 1966, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States passed the following resolution:

"WHEREAS the NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program is succeeding in its purpose of increasing the available supply of well educated college teachers, and hence contributing to the national interest;

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States requests its officers to urge the Congress to restore the originally planned number of fellowships, beginning with the academic year 1967-68;

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Congress be urged to continue the National Defense Education Act beyond its present expiration date."

January 1967 Memorandum on NDEA Title IV Policies and Procedures

On January 25, 1967, Dean Predmore sent to all title IV coordinators a memorandum stating that the Title IV Advisory Committee meeting of November 15-16, 1966, had brought no modifications of policies or procedures. His memorandum was addressed to procedures announced in the November 16, 1966, letter of award and to related items. He wrote that the three new policies set forth in that letter would become effective in the fall of 1967, at which time they would apply to all title IV fellows unless the coordinators wished to certify that earlier commitments to certain individuals remained in force.

The \$1000 ceiling was meant to fix the maximum supplementation allowable during a 12-month period beginning in the fall. It could be paid for appropriate services rendered during the academic year or the summer session. The monetary restriction on supplementation was consonant with that of other Federal fellowship programs, but the restriction of the NDEA title IV program was limited to service appointments judged to have training value and was further restricted to the second and third year of the fellowship. The intention was to exclude all employment during the first year of fellowship tenure. The rule did *not* apply to advanced students granted a 1-year or 2-year vacated award. It did apply to beginning students awarded a vacated fellowship and to advanced students in the first year of a 3-year fellowship.

Dean Predmore's memorandum clarified the distinction in the policies governing interruptions of tenure and leaves of absence. Interruptions in tenure were to be granted only for activities directly related to academic study and which allowed normal progress toward the degree. These included research or teaching assistantships, requisite field work, and study abroad. The Graduate Academic Programs Branch was to be notified of each interruption in tenure. Although wide latitude was permitted in defining an appropriate field experience, the complete disruption represented by full-time paid employment off campus was not acceptable. Leaves of absence were to be granted only for emergency situations, such as illness, which were beyond the control of students.

Higher Education Amendments of 1967 Introduced

On February 28, 1967, Representative Carl D. Perkins, who had become Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and Senator Wayne Morse, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, introduced identical bills (H.R. 6232 and S. 1126) cited as the "Higher Education Amendments of 1967." There were extensive bills, 80 pages long with 10 separate titles, amending the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965, and the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

The amendments to the NDEA title IV, National Defense Fellowships, appeared as part E of title IV, Student Assistance, rather than under title V, Education Professions Development Act, as one might normally expect inasmuch as the focus of the fellowship program was directed toward the profession of college teaching. However, the fact that the Education Professions Development Program was targeted mostly toward the training of elementary and secondary school teachers and had a different origin—title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965—it was decided to keep the NDEA title IV program separate from it.

The identical bills proposed extending the authorization of the NDEA title IV program for an additional 5 years. They also would increase the maximum tenure of fellowships from 3 to 4 years in special circumstances and would require institutional effort to encourage recipients to enter or continue teaching. The bills required the Commissioner of Education to pay to persons awarded fellowships such stipends (including such allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he might determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable programs.

Hearings on Higher Education Amendments of 1967

Hearings on the Higher Education Amendments of 1967 opened before Edith Green's Special Subcommittee on Education on April 17 and continued for 7 more days until May 2. In August these House hearings were resumed for 4 days, on the 16th, 17th, 18th, and 23rd. The Senate hearings opened in Eugene, Ore., on April 26 and continued in Washington on May 25 and June 26.

No testimony was given on the proposed NDEA title IV amendments in either the House or the Senate hearings in 1967. As mentioned, the identical bills were very comprehensive and it was too much to expect that hearings on all parts of the bill could be conducted during that year. Congress decided to concentrate on certain aspects of the bill: the Education Professions Development Program, since it was closely related to the National Teacher Corps Program whose authorization would expire on June 30, 1967; and the Student Loan Program, particularly Guaranteed Student Loan Insurance.

Information and Forms for 1968-69 Fellowships sent to Coordinators

On March 3, 1967, Dean Predmore sent to all title IV coordinators the forms for progress reports and new applications for NDEA title IV fellowships for 1968-69. The forms, which were essentially the same as those of the previous year, were also sent to presidents of institutions which were authorized to offer doctoral programs but had not received title IV fellowships for the year 1967-68.

An accompanying memorandum stated that 1968-69 would be the final year of the 3-year allocation cycle begun in 1966-67. Coordinators were informed that the Office of Education intended—subject to appropriations by Congress

and satisfactory progress reports of approved programs—to honor its commitment to maintain through 1968–69 a minimum guarantee of title IV fellowships to participating institutions.

The guaranteed minimum allocation to each institution for 1968–69 was 75 percent of its 1966–67 share, except that, as in the previous year, institutions receiving 25 or fewer fellowships that year would receive 100 percent of that number again. Institutions that received more than 25 fellowships were guaranteed no fewer than 25 for 1968–69. This guarantee extended as well to institutions receiving fellowships for the first time in 1967–68.

The memorandum stated that progress reports on already-approved programs could be supplemented by applications for approval of additional programs or by a special request for greater assistance. An institutional statement in support of an increased number of fellowships was optional.

Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation Seeks Cooperative Relationship with Title IV Program

In April of 1967, the Ford Foundation announced that, in cooperation with 10 leading university graduate schools, it was inaugurating a major experimental program aimed at reforming doctoral education in the social sciences and the humanities.³ The program was scheduled to extend over the next seven academic years with the assistance of \$41.5 million from the Ford Foundation, \$160 million of the universities' own resources, and available Government funds. It was estimated that some 10,500 Ph. D. students would be directly affected during the period of the program.

The aim of the Ford Foundation's program was the nationwide achievement of quality and efficacy in education for the Ph. D. degree. The announcement stated that, even in leading institutions, fewer than half of the students embarking on doctoral studies in the humanities and social sciences eventually received the Ph. D. degree; and, further, that the graduate student in these fields took a median of 7½ years to attain the doctorate, compared to 5 years in the natural sciences.

At the same time that it was planning to inaugurate this new program the Ford Foundation announced that its future support for the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Program would be aimed at meeting special needs rather than granting across-the-board fellowships. Since 1958 the Ford Foundation had given a total of \$52 million for the annual award of about 1,000 first-year fellowships and a smaller number of dissertation-year fellowships. Over the next 3 years, the Ford Foundation planned to make grants to the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation to fund 100 dissertation fellowships a year at universities not otherwise assisted in the Ford Foundation graduate education program.

Because of the changed direction of Ford Foundation

³The universities involved were the Universities of California (Berkeley), Chicago, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin; and Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale Universities.

support of graduate education, Hans Rosenhaupt, National Director of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, wrote on June 7, 1967, to Associate Commissioner for Higher Education Peter Muirhead, suggesting a cooperative relationship between the Woodrow Wilson Foundation and the NDEA title IV program. Dr. Rosenhaupt wrote that he envisioned a program under which a certain percentage of title IV fellowships would be awarded directly to outstanding candidates identified by Woodrow Wilson selection committees, and which might be held at any graduate school of the candidate's choice. The authority for nominating these fellowship candidates would not be vested in the graduate schools. The Woodrow Wilson program, Dr. Rosenhaupt said, was well qualified to perform this task through its identification system embracing more than 200 selection committee members and 1,000 campus representatives. At the time of his letter, 804 colleges had produced Woodrow Wilson winners.

Dr. Rosenhaupt wrote that he believed the 1964 amendments would permit the award of fellowships under the plan he was suggesting and he felt that the proposed cooperation was feasible for the following reasons:

1. Arrangements such as that between the Federal Government and the Institute of International Education, which administers the Fulbright fellowship program on a contract basis, had shown the feasibility of close cooperation between the Federal Government and private agencies.

2. Precedents for fellowships vested in the students rather than in the institutions had been set by the G.I. Bills and by the National Science Foundation's graduate program.

3. The Woodrow Wilson system of regional quota guaranteed broad geographic distribution of fellowships.

4. A program vesting fellowships in students identified by a national competition would contribute to the prestige and thus the general appeal of the title IV program.

Appropriation for Fiscal Year 1968

The Division of Graduate Programs requested a \$107,300,000 appropriation for fiscal 1968 for title IV fellowships. This request was intended to fund during 1968–69 7,500 new fellowships (the maximum authorized), and 11,725 from previous years. When this request reached the Bureau of the Budget, however, it was reduced to \$96,600,000. This figure, which was transmitted to Congress in the President's Budget Message, would support only 5,460 new fellowships in addition to the 11,775 continuing fellowships for a total increase of 2,460 over the 14,775 supported from the fiscal 1967 appropriation.

At the Senate hearings on March 13, 1967, Associate Commissioner Muirhead was asked by Senator Lister Hill, Appropriations Subcommittee chairman, why this number of fellowships was needed. Mr. Muirhead explained:

"There is, of course, a direct correlation between the number of college students and the demand for qualified teachers. It would obviously be self-defeating to greatly increase the number of students through various forms of

student aid without at the same time attempting to increase the number of college teachers to cope with the increased enrollment. We have made every effort, therefore, to provide maximum support for this program within existing budgetary limitations."⁴

\$10 Million Cut in Title IV Appropriation Recommended by House Committee

The appropriation bill, H.R. 10196, was reported out of the House Committee on Appropriations by Representative Daniel J. Flood, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who had replaced Representative John Fogarty of Rhode Island as chairman of the subcommittee having cognizance of appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. Mr. Fogarty had died suddenly just a few hours before the 90th Congress was to convene.

For the first time in the history of the title IV program, the recommended appropriation did not come under the heading of Defense Education Activities. Instead, the title IV program was included with Higher Education Activities. The House Committee recommended a \$10 million reduction in the \$96.6 million requested by the President for college teacher fellowships:

"For Higher Educational Activities, the Committee recommended \$1,158,194,000, a reduction of \$15 million below the request but \$9.6 million above the appropriation for 1967. The Committee recommended a shift of \$10 million of the increased budget for teacher fellowships to construction of public community colleges and technical institutes.

"In the opinion of the Committee, there is a serious question that within the total amounts budgeted for education programs, there is too much emphasis on scholarships, opportunity grants, and fellowships, as compared with loans, work-study programs, and construction of facilities."⁵

H.R. 10196 was taken up for consideration in the House on May 25, 1967, on a motion by Mr. Flood. Before getting to the discussion of the appropriation bill, Representative Flood and Representative Melvin R. Laird, Republican of Wisconsin and ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare, spent several minutes in eulogy of Mr. Fogarty for his many years of distinguished service in connection with appropriation bills for these departments.

Representative Broyhill Introduces Amendment Excluding Disruptive Students

The recommended \$10 million shift in funds from the title IV program to construction for community colleges and technical institutes did not come under floor discus-

sion. However, an amendment to the appropriations bill of pertinence to the title IV program was introduced by Representative Joel T. Broyhill, Republican of Virginia:

"Sec. 907. No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, with respect to any individual who—

- (1) incites, promotes, encourages, or carries on, or facilitates the incitement, promotion, encouragement, or carrying on of, a riot or other civil disturbance in violation of Federal, State or local laws designed to preserve the peace of the community concerned or to protect the persons or property of residents of such community; or
- (2) assists, encourages, or instructs any person to commit or perform any act specified in paragraph (1)."⁶

Mr. Flood said that he had advised his subcommittee members of the pending Broyhill amendment, and they were agreeable to it. The amendment was then agreed to by the House by a voice vote.

Senate Committee Agrees to House Cut of \$10 Million for Title IV Program

On August 1, 1967, H.R. 10196 was reported out of the Senate Committee on Appropriations by Mr. Hill. The Senate Committee recommended the same amount (\$1,158,194,000) for Higher Educational Activities as had the House Committee. The Committee agreed with the House recommendation to shift \$10 million of the increase requested for college teacher fellowships to construction of public community colleges and technical institutes.⁷

With regard to riots and civil disturbances, the committee struck the House provision and substituted language similar to that contained in section 1201 of the Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966.

The House section appeared to apply whether or not there had been a conviction. The Senate Committee provision applied only to convicted persons. The Senate Committee replaced the House version of section 907 of the appropriations bill by the following:

"Sec. 907. No part of the funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to provide payments, assistance, or services, in any form, with respect to any individual convicted in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction, of inciting, promoting, carrying on a riot, or any group activity resulting in material damage to property or injury to persons, found to be in violation of Federal, State, or local laws designed to protect persons or property in the community concerned."⁸

Conference Report Accepted

In the conference report of October 3, 1967, the language of the Senate version of section 907 was adopted in lieu

⁴ *Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations, 1968. Hearings Before a Subcommittee on Appropriations. Senate. 90th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 519.*

⁵ *Report No. 21. House. 90th Congress, 1st Session. May 22, 1967. p. 10.*

⁶ *Congressional Record. Vol. 113. Part 11. 90th Congress, 1st Session. May 25, 1967. p. 14090.*

⁷ *Report No. 469. Senate. 90th Congress, 1st Session. August 1, 1967. p. 13.*

⁸ *Ibid., p. 59.*

of that of the House. The conference report was approved by both the House and the Senate, and H.R. 10196 was signed by President Johnson into Public Law 90-132 on November 8, 1967. For the first time since the appropriation act for fiscal 1962, the appropriation law did not contain a restricting clause stating that no part of the appropriation could be made available for fellowships which were not found by the Commissioner of Education to be consistent with the purposes of NDEA as stated in section 101 thereof.

Consultant Panelists Convene for Annual Review

On June 14-16, 1967, 71 consultant panelists (down from 80 the previous year) convened at the Office of Education

to evaluate the 2,770 progress reports, 626 new submissions, and 82 reorganized programs seeking fellowship support for 1968-69. The procedures followed were the same as those of the previous year. The panelists were formed into 22 panels covering the various subacademic areas. As in previous years, they were asked in their evaluations to give highest priority to the quality of programs and to be on the lookout for weak or declining departments or those without prospects for development within the foreseeable future. They were strongly urged to justify or amplify each rating, as this was invaluable to both the Title IV Advisory Committee in its review and in forming a basis for answering inquiries on the approval or nonapproval of programs.

CHAPTER XII

tenth year of operation

David B. Carpenter, a sociologist and Graduate Dean at Washington University in St. Louis, Mo., assumed in July of 1967 responsibility for guiding title IV activities during the year 1967-68.

Advisory Committee Meeting of July 10-12, 1967

The first task facing Dean Carpenter upon his assumption of duties as Chief of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch was the convening of the Title IV Advisory Committee July 10-12. At this meeting the Committee was to review program applications that had been rated by the panelists in June and to recommend institutional allocations of title IV fellowships for the academic year 1968-69.

Four Substantive Issues Discussed

Before proceeding to program review and fellowship allocation, the Committee discussed four substantive issues: (1) support of religion as a field of objective scholarship;

(2) problems of fragmentation or proliferation in academic programs requesting support; (3) a proposal by the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation that it receive an allocation of NDEA title IV fellowships for direct award to students selected by the Foundation; and (4) action to be taken with respect to approved programs which failed to comply with the requirement that a satisfactory progress report be submitted annually.

The Support of Religion as a Field of Objective Scholarship. The Committee was informed that one university had during the preceding year proposed its department of religion for support but the department had been disqualified on the technical ground that its application failed to include a faculty list. However, now four universities—Columbia, Duke, Harvard, and Yale—had submitted programs in this area, and all of them were highly rated by the humanities panelists.

The question was whether or not these four programs could be supported under title IV. The 1964 amendments

excluded support for any program which was designed "specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects." Arguments in favor of support were based on: consideration of the differences in the meaning between theological tenets and theological subjects; the purposes of the program; and the program as a field of objective scholarship. After some discussion the following resolution was passed:

"Any program for the study of religion in any institution which is otherwise eligible for NDEA Title IV support and which is conducted in a nonsectarian manner in accordance with accepted criteria of objective scholarship should be eligible for support under NDEA Title IV and other relevant Federal programs in education."

Fragmentation or Proliferation in Academic Programs. From the time in 1965 when the "bloc allocation" of fellowships to institutions was instituted, the Graduate Academic Programs Branch had become increasingly aware of the tendency on the part of some universities to submit for approval programs which were basically components of broader programs. It was noted, for example, that the doctorate in education might be offered in seven to 10 programs, the doctorate in business administration might constitute at least five programs, and the doctorate in engineering might appear in three to six or even more programs. There was the feeling that some universities might be consciously pursuing this practice in order to build a larger list of approved programs which might reflect favorably on the institution's image and hopefully result in a greater allocation of fellowships.

After thorough discussion of this matter, the Advisory Committee agreed that each institution should be permitted to exercise its traditional freedom to name its doctoral programs as it chose. The Committee recommended, however, that the Office of Education continue to accept proposals on the existing bases but, in order to make fellowship allocations more equitable, that the review panels be furnished with up-to-date information on: (1) the doctoral program performance at each institution, (2) the number of faculty and percent of time they devoted to each program, (3) the status of the academic organizational unit offering each doctoral program, (4) student enrollment, (5) degree production, and (6) library and other facilities. The Advisory Committee further recommended that the review panels exercise particular care each year to assure that the recognized programs continue to be strong ones.

Proposed Cooperation with the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. F. Champion Ward, Ford Foundation Vice President for the Division of Education and Research, met with the Advisory Committee to describe the new Ford Foundation program and discuss the possibility of cooperation with the Office of Education as proposed in the Rosenhaupt letter of June 7. (This letter was discussed in the preceding chapter.) After the Ward presentation, the Advisory Committee discussed the matter and passed the following resolution:

"The Ford Foundation has withdrawn most of its support for the fellowship program of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation while, however, continuing support of its procedures in the identification and selection of excellent candidates for graduate fellowships. In view of this it has been proposed that the NDEA Title IV program cooperate with the Woodrow Wilson Foundation in a joint fellowship program.

"The Advisory Committee recognizes the contribution of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation in the identification, selection, and training of college and university teachers and hopes that the academic community will continue to use and to benefit from the Foundation's experience. The Committee advises, however, that no action be taken on the Woodrow Wilson proposal of a joint fellowship program until the level of fellowships funded substantially exceeds the 6,000 currently distributed. The Committee sees merit in the principle of a national individual competition and suggests that the Woodrow Wilson proposal be explored along with other possible approaches to such a competition."

Action Regarding Institutions Failing to Submit Progress Reports or Submitting Unsatisfactory Ones. The final topic of discussion involved continuation of support to institutions after they had been awarded an initial allocation of fellowships. In accordance with NDEA title IV legislative requirements, each participating institution was awarded fellowships for use in approved academic programs for a 3-year period. In the 2 succeeding years after initial approval, the institution was required to submit progress reports on all of its approved programs in order to receive continued fellowship support. Progress reports were evaluated to assure that programs were maintaining their quality. With respect to these reports, two situations requiring decisions had arisen: some institutions had failed to submit the necessary reports, or they had been given one or more unsatisfactory program evaluations by the review panels. The Committee recommended that the Office of Education staff be guided by the following policies:

"1. It is the judgment of the Advisory Committee that the departmental progress reports are an integral part of the NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program necessary for adequate maintenance of standards. Therefore, departments which do not submit such reports to the Office of Education by the appropriate deadline established by that Office shall be removed from the approved list for their institution and shall not be permitted to appoint new fellows to fill vacated fellowships.

"2. Departments which are recommended by panels and by the Advisory Committee for disapproval on the basis of inadequate progress as indicated by the progress reports shall not be permitted to appoint new fellows or fill vacated fellowships.

"3. In either case, new approval can be obtained only by the submission of a new program proposal."

Review of Programs and Recommendation of Fellowship Allocations

After the four policy issues were disposed of, the Committee proceeded to the review of the ratings of programs by the panelists and the consideration of institutional fellowship allocations.

As in the competitions of the 2 preceding years, the Committee divided itself into subgroups. Four subgroups of three members each were formed, which represented the Northeast, Southeast, Midwest, and West regions. Each group was assisted by a staff coordinator.

Request Denied for Admissibility of Certain Programs on Study of Religion

At the same time that the Title IV Advisory Committee at its meeting of July 10, 1967, was recommending support of programs at four universities in the study of religion, Commissioner of Education Harold Howe sent to Alanson W. Willcox, General Counsel for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, a request for an early determination as to whether or not Office of Education support of these programs would be in any violation of the laws or intent of Congress.

The Commissioner's memorandum went into a detailed discussion of the history of congressional action on this matter. Congressional action had led to the 1964 amendment which denied the award of fellowships in programs that specifically prepared students to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects. The Commissioner felt that the four programs fell outside these restrictions because none of them was administered by a school or department of divinity and none of them was designed to prepare religious education workers or ministers. On the contrary, they were scholarly Ph. D. programs tracing the historical development of religions in general and their impact on civilizations.

After thorough consideration of the matter, the General Counsel ruled against approval of the programs at that time.

Bureau Recommendations on Allocations of Fellowships for 1968-69

On November 16, 1967, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education Peter Muirhead sent to Commissioner of Education Howe a list of the proposed allocations of title IV fellowships for 1968-69. In his memorandum of transmittal, Mr. Muirhead stated that three factors stood out in the consideration of these allocations. The most immediate was the 45 percent reduction in requested funds for new fellowships which resulted in a 1968-69 allocation of approximately 45 percent fewer new three-year fellowships for almost all participating institutions. The original request of \$100 million would have funded 5,460 new fellowships of the 7,500 authorized but the appropriation of \$86.6 million was sufficient for only 3,328 new fellowships in

addition to 6,000 continuing fellows in their second year and 6,000 in their third year. A maximum of 45 fellowships, as compared with 85 the preceding year and a minimum of two fellowships, as compared with four the preceding year, had to be placed into effect in order to distribute the fellowships as equitably as possible.

A second factor was the virtually universal coverage of American institutions which grant the doctorate. One hundred and ninety-nine institutions, six more than in the preceding year, were approved for support in 1968-69. This total came out of a universe of approximately 225 institutions, some of which were theological schools and ineligible for title IV support. The number of approved programs had risen to 2,990, compared to 2,690 the previous year. The previous policy of requesting that two-thirds of the fellowships be distributed to programs in the humanities, social sciences, and education, insofar as possible at each institution, was to be continued. This policy was intended to balance support available from other Federal agencies which were restricted to fellowship grants in the sciences and engineering. Mr. Muirhead pointed out that the NDEA title IV program was the only Federal predoctoral fellowship authority to provide noncategorical support within the humanities and fine arts.

The third factor was that the proposed allocation ended the 3-year cycle of support which began with academic year 1966-67, under which the Office of Education undertook a commitment to support participating institutions so long as they maintained acceptable progress. Although support available for new fellowships for 1968-69 was the lowest in the cycle, no institution approved for 1967-68 was to be denied new fellowships in 1968-69. On the advice of the Advisory Committee, Mr. Muirhead said that the nature and scope of this commitment was to be reexamined in preparation for the next cycle beginning with the 1969-70 academic year.

House Subcommittee Report Lauds Title IV Program

Late in the fall of 1967, the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee issued its report, *Study of the United States Office of Education*,¹ which had been authorized in 1966 by House Resolution 614, 89th Congress.

Carried out under the direction of Representative Edith Green, subcommittee chairman, the study was very comprehensive and detailed, delving into all facets of Office of Education programs and operations. In regard to the NDEA title IV program, the report was laudatory. It stated:

"In spite of the tremendous workload of the NDEA fellowship program, and in spite of the occasional shortcuts the Branch (Graduate Academic Programs Branch) must take to stay abreast, the subcommittee finds that, for the most part, the higher education community has been quite

¹ *Study of the United States Office of Education*. House Document No. 193. 90th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967. p. 110.

pleased with the administration of the program through the years."

The study surmised that the general satisfaction noted among users of the title IV program was due, to a considerable extent, to two unique operational features of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch. The first of these was the use of a small corps of regional coordinators who visited applicant institutions and discussed with their officers the evaluations made by academic panels with regard to programs approved or disapproved for fellowship support. The second feature was the practice of the Branch to invite each year, to serve as its head, a graduate dean on leave from some participating institution. Although this practice involved considerable additional work by the Director of the Division of Graduate Programs in his yearly search for new leadership, the subcommittee felt that this burden was compensated for by the excellent rapport which had developed between the Branch and the higher education community as a result of the custom.

The subcommittee thought so highly of these two practices that it felt other divisions and branches of the Office of Education could improve their general effectiveness by examining the procedures.

While its expressed general satisfaction with the NDEA fellowship program, the subcommittee noted that there was little hard evidence to indicate that the program was, in fact, fulfilling two of its basic purposes: increasing the number of qualified college teachers, and promoting a greater and wider geographical distribution of quality graduate programs. Needed, it said, were detailed figures on how many ex-fellows were currently teaching in colleges, how many had taught at that level and left, what their reasons were for leaving, how many had gone into industry and other fields. Noting that the staff of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch carried a full workload in just keeping the program going, the subcommittee suggested that the National Center for Educational Statistics was the likely organ for compiling these figures. The subcommittee made the specific recommendation that the Graduate Academic Programs Branch, working through the National Center for Educational Statistics, develop by January 1, 1968, data from which Congress could determine how well the Graduate Fellowship Program was meeting congressional purposes.

Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of November 29, 1967

The Title IV Advisory Committee held a 1-day meeting on November 29, 1967. The Committee met to consider the implications of the Education Professions Development Act, fiscal year 1968 appropriations, and the proposed legislation in the Higher Education Amendments of 1967 as they affected both graduate education in general and the fellowship program in particular.

The meeting was opened by Commissioner Howe who discussed the current Federal legislative, administrative, and fiscal situations. He stressed the need for effective coordination among programs of teacher training in the Office

of Education and suggested that the authority contained in the Education Professions Development Act would provide a framework within which to achieve this end. Following Mr. Howe, Associate Commissioner Muirhead suggested that the Advisory Committee consider particularly the new training authority for junior and liberal arts college teachers with respect to the most effective manner of administering this training program in the Bureau of Higher Education.

The meeting was chaired by J. Wayne Reitz who came to the Office of Education in September 1967 from the presidency of the University of Florida to become Director of the Division of Graduate Programs. Presentations concerning the NDEA title IV fellowship program and other higher education matters were made by Preston Valien, who had been promoted in August of 1967 from Director of the Division of Graduate Programs to Deputy Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, and David B. Carpenter, Chief of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch.

Discussion about Fellows Affected by Selective Service Law

A number of policy issues involving title IV program administration were considered by the Advisory Committee. In addition to the technical issues of institutional supplementation and compensation for student teaching, the Committee devoted attention to the possibility of a quantum increase in fellowship resignations because of the new Selective Service law to become effective the following July 1. In order to ease the impact of the draft, the Committee recommended that universities be allowed to select alternate fellowship candidates up to the opening of the fall semester in 1968. The rewarding of vacated fellowships during the academic year was discussed but deferred as a possibility for the immediate future. The Committee further recommended that institutions be encouraged to assume the responsibility for supporting fellowship holders upon their return from military service. This policy would place the NDEA fellowship program generally in accord with policies followed by the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The Committee also recommended that the Office of Education consider seeking legislation to encourage veterans to resume their academic studies.

The requirement that two-thirds of the fellowships be devoted exclusively to first-year graduate students was reconsidered by the Committee in view of the uncertain student population for the next year. It was recommended that the Office of Education be prepared to relax this rule should exigencies warrant it.

On another topic, the Committee reaffirmed the title IV emphasis upon support to students in the humanities, social sciences, and education, by continuing to request participating universities to devote two-thirds of their fellowships to such students.

The Committee stressed its opposition to increasing the amount of stipends because of the effect this would have

upon university teaching assistantships and other student financial awards funded from institutional sources.

Finally, the Committee recommended creation of Federal standards for student stipends in various fellowship and traineeship programs based upon prior consultation with the university community.

Decision on Proposal from Woodrow Wilson Foundation Reaffirmed

In response to continued interest by the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation for cooperative administration of NDEA title IV fellowships, the Committee reaffirmed its resolution of July 10 that consideration of such a venture await funding in excess of 6,000 new three-year fellowships annually. Moreover, it was felt that if this proposal became a reality, the Office of Education might prefer to create its own program of national student competition and make it similar to the fellowship programs of the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health.

With regard to program competition for fellowships tenable in 1969-1970 (anticipating passage of the legislation then pending in Congress), the Committee recommended several revisions in the application format for institutional proposals. Particular attention was devoted to requiring evidence that NDEA title IV fellowships had produced college teachers trained at the Ph. D. level.

Congress and Institutions Notified of Fellowship Allocations for 1968-69

On December 26, 1967, Congress was officially notified of the allocation of 3,328 new fellowships. The announcement stated that, of 2,990 programs approved for award of the fellowships, 43 percent were in the humanities, social sciences, and education; 57 percent in the biological sciences, physical sciences, and engineering.

Immediately after notifying Congress, Dean Carpenter sent a letter to each institution which had applied for title IV support, informing the institutions how many new fellowships had been allocated to it for use in 1968-69 and the approved programs in which the fellowships could be used. He pointed out that available funds had permitted the award of only 3,328 three-year fellowships for tenure beginning in 1968-69, compared with 6,000 such fellowships awarded for 1967-68. Dean Carpenter requested that each institution, insofar as possible, continue the previously announced policy of awarding two-thirds of its allocation for use in the humanities, social sciences, and education.

The letter stated that now, for the first time, programs which granted the Doctor of Juridical Sciences degree (J.S.D.), intended primarily for college and university teaching of law, had been approved for support. Only programs which awarded a research doctorate were eligible to participate in the title IV program. Doctoral programs which did not require a research dissertation—such as Doctor of Medicine (M.D.), Dentistry (D.D.S.), Arts (D.A.), and Law (J.D.)—were ineligible.

Dean Carpenter's letter also announced that this allocation of fellowships was the last under existing authority, ending the three-year cycle of support which began with the academic year 1966-67. He added that legislation to extend the NDEA title IV program was still pending before the Congress.

Possibility Raised of Rewarding Fractional Years of Vacated Fellowships

In a memorandum in late December, Division Director Reitz asked Dean Carpenter and his staff to consider the possibility of reawarding unused fractional portions of vacated fellowships. "It appears to be," he wrote, "that our policy of awarding fellowships for an academic year only and not providing for filling vacated fellowships during the year is not the best use of our available funds, particularly when the subvention to the institution remained the same even though a fellowship is vacated."

Dean Carpenter replied that it was his recommendation that, beginning in 1968-69, universities be permitted to nominate replacement fellows for tenure beginning in the first full semester or quarter (other than summer) following the resignation or termination of an award, with replacement nominations requiring the same eligibility screening as new fellowship nominations. Of course, in order to implement such a policy, there had to be assurance of sufficient funds. Dean Carpenter reported to Dr. Reitz that the fiscal year 1968 budget of \$86.6 million for title IV fellowships would permit the Office of Education to fund in 1968-69 a total of 15,328 fellows through a full fellowship year at an average cost of \$5,650. This average cost was broken down as follows: \$2,250, the average academic year stipend; \$400 dependency allowance for the average of one dependent during the academic year; \$400 stipend plus \$100 for an average of one dependent during a summer session; and \$2,500 cost-of-education allowance to the institution. Hence, if the calculation of average cost was correct, reaward of fellowships at the beginning of any academic term would be possible.

New Policies and Regulations Outlined for Coordinators

On January 24, 1968, Dean Carpenter sent to all title IV coordinators a memorandum bringing them up to date on policy matters and plans for the title IV program.

Coordinators were told that, in view of the fact that an institution received a cost-of-education allowance of \$2,500 per year in lieu of a fellow's tuition, it was the policy of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch to disapprove summer fellowship support in institutions which made an additional summer tuition charge against the fellows.

The memorandum stated that, as previously announced, a title IV fellow was permitted a maximum of \$1,000 supplementation a year from institutional funds during both the second and third year of the fellowship. Such supplementation might or might not be associated with teaching or research activities, which always had to be relevant to

the student's field of study. A new policy change was that fellows in their first year of title IV fellowship tenure were now permitted similar supplementation, provided such fellows were not in their first year of graduate study. The ban against supplementation did not apply to fellows off tenure and not receiving a stipend.

"Higher Education Amendments of 1968"—Bills Introduced

On February 5, 1968, H.R. 15067, entitled Higher Education Amendments of 1968, was introduced in the House by Representative Carl Perkins, Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, on behalf of himself and Representative Edith Green, Chairman of the House Special Subcommittee on Education which had the responsibility for higher education legislation.

H.R. 15067 was a very comprehensive bill, containing 12 titles and 118 pages. The bill proposed the extension and revision of 16 programs and suggested the creation of four new ones. In addition, it proposed the consolidation of the four student-aid programs into the Educational Opportunity Act of 1968. In part, H.R. 15067 was identical to H.R. 6232, the Higher Education Amendments of 1967, and in part similar to it. The amendments proposed by H.R. 15067 with respect to National Defense Fellowships were identical to those proposed the previous year in H.R. 6232.

On March 5, Senator Wayne Morse, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, introduced S. 3098, a bill identical to H.R. 15067, introduced in the House exactly a month earlier. It was read twice and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Hearings on H.R. 15067

On February 6, 1968, just one day after H.R. 15067 was introduced in the House, Mrs. Green opened hearings on the bill. She remarked that her bill posed many issues, some of which were related to matters discussed in the *Study of the United States Office of Education*, and some of which were related to questions of pressing national concern, in particular the impact of the current draft policy on graduate and undergraduate education.

Mrs. Green pointed out that H.R. 15067 proposed the extension of 16 programs beyond their expiration date of June 30, 1968, and that without legislation extending them there could be no authorization for the Appropriations Committee to recommend funds for fiscal year 1969. Because of the problems caused by late authorization and late funding of programs, she said she felt it absolutely essential to begin hearings on the bill one day after its introduction. She indicated that she might ask her congressional colleagues and the Office of Education to consider concentration first on noncontroversial parts of the bill and moving these along faster than some of the other parts which might take longer.

The House hearings took place on 8 days in February and 6 days in March, ending on March 8. There was no direct testimony on the proposed amendments to title IV

of NDEA except on the provision which would permit the Commissioner to pay to institutions of higher education cost-of-education allowances which he determined to be consistent with the prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs. This flexibility was also to apply to Title V-C, Prospective and Experienced Teacher Fellowships, of the Higher Education Act of 1965. In support of this provision, Commissioner Howe's prepared statement explained:

"Without knowing the exact cost of graduate education, we are convinced that the present \$2,500 cost of education allowance is at least \$1,000 too low. The Administration, therefore, proposes to move toward a \$3,500 cost of education allowance for all Federal fellowship programs beginning with Fiscal Year 1969. We will be proposing the \$3,500 figure for all new Office of Education-sponsored fellowships beginning next fall if this new flexible authority is granted. This could mean that within 3 years all fellowships, new and continuing, would be covered by the higher figure. While this will not turn our colleges and universities into profit-making organizations, it should add a degree of equity to our support and ease somewhat the burden of these institutions."²

As mentioned earlier, Mrs. Green was particularly concerned about the existing military draft policies. She said that the committee could not make an intelligent judgment on what to do in the graduate field without knowing what effect the draft policy would have on enrollment and on subject matter areas. She said that she had read projections stating that some graduate schools expected their enrollments might be reduced by 50 percent. She asked Commissioner Howe to comment. Commissioner Howe said that the situation was very complex and that it was difficult to come up with precise figures. He pointed out that the National Security Council had the power to declare certain fields of study essential to the national security, but he personally opposed designating any such fields.

"When you start seeking to segregate subject fields that are sort of national priority needs, you find pressures to put the sciences and mathematics in the special categories, pressures to leave the arts and the humanities without any attention. I would argue that for the long range health of education itself, and the country as a whole, that is not a particularly sensible policy."³

Commissioner Howe said that he believed there should be no exemption for graduate students from the obligation to military service, but he preferred a random selection procedure rather than the existing oldest-first draft policy.

On February 15, 1968, the National Security Council advised the Director of Selective Service, Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, U.S.A. (Ret.), to suspend occupational deferments based on the list of essential activities and critical

² *Higher Education Amendments of 1968*. Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House, 90th Congress, 2d Session, Part 1. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 2.

³ *Ibid.*, Part 2. p. 520.

occupations and to end deferment of graduate students other than those in the second or subsequent year of graduate study. Those in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy were to continue being deferred. In a telegram to State Selective Service Directors, General Hershey affirmed that the sequence of selection in filling calls was to remain unchanged, so that the oldest men from the combined age group 19 through 25 were to be called first. Each local draft board was given the discretion to grant, in individual cases, occupational deferments based on a showing of essential community need. Community need was not defined.

In followup of the February 15, 1968, announcement of the National Security Council, these persons testified before Mrs. Green's subcommittee: Dr. Merriam H. Trytten, President, Scientific Manpower Commission; Betty M. Vetter, Executive Director, Scientific Manpower Commission; and General Hershey. Mrs. Vetter presented statistics on the number of draft-eligible men in various categories and the possible impact of the draft. She said:

"The loss to individual graduate schools will vary widely. All-male institutions will, of course, be harder hit than co-educational graduate schools. The highest ranking graduate schools in the Nation should be able to fill up their classes by dipping further down in the quality of applicants for acceptance.

"For those smaller or newer graduate schools still seeking a high-quality level who are not now over-burdened with applicants, there will certainly be at least 50 percent drop-off in both the first and second year classes of graduate study. Some schools will not be able to survive these conditions.

"The effect on the undergraduate schools will be just as striking as on the graduate schools both in short and long range terms. No effect to extend teaching assistantships will fill the teaching assistant positions needed to take care of burgeoning undergraduate enrollments.

"Effect on the Nation:

"All segments of the economy will be affected by the loss of this highly trained manpower, and we must be realistic in recognizing that the loss is real, and not simply a transfer of effort from one segment of the economy to another."⁴

Dr. Trytten warned about the effect that the existing draft policies would have on scientific progress in the United States. "There can be little doubt," he said, "that scientific effort in the United States will pay a substantial penalty. At the very best, two man-years, and indeed closer to three man-years, of scientific work will be lost for each prospective graduate student for as many years as present policies continue."⁵

Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, was of similar view. He said:

"I want publicly to predict that this country may well pay within a very short time, a very high price indeed for

this policy in terms of our failing to have an adequate supply of trained scientific and technical manpower.

"What I am really doing here is making a comment, in some measure based on the very alarming statement of Mrs. Vetter, to repeat, that 'It seems quite possible we may find ourselves at a severe disadvantage in our efforts to prevent the spread of communism a few years from now.'"⁶

General Hershey elaborated, for the subcommittee's benefit, on Selective Service policies and procedures. Mrs. Green asked him if he considered as accurate *Science* magazine's statement that the Department of Defense reported over 55 percent of the next year's draft call would be comprised of college graduates and graduate students, whereas only 4 percent of 230,000 inductees in 1967 had held college degrees. General Hershey replied that, although he couldn't prove it, he thought that the 55 percent estimate was higher than what it would actually turn out to be. In justification of the current Selective Service policies, General Hershey quoted from his letter of February 20, 1968, to Representative L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat of South Carolina, Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, in which he wrote:

"The present method of calling available and qualified men between the ages of 19 and 26, oldest first, is a system of selection which has been equitable and effective through more than 20 years of Selective Service operation. This fact, of course, does not make change inconceivable; however, the fact that it has produced the required manpower is an excellent reason why it has been continued."⁷

Several distinguished educators appeared before Mrs. Green's subcommittee and urged that she do what she could to get the draft policies in regard to graduate students changed. They were: Dr. Fred Harrington, President of the University of Wisconsin; Dr. Kingman Brewster, President of Yale University; Dr. John Miller, Graduate Dean at Yale University; and Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, President of Harvard University. The following statement by Dr. Pusey was typical of the points of view of these witnesses who, in addition to representing their own institutions, spoke on behalf of the various leading associations of higher education in the country:

"It does seem to us, for a lot of reasons, that there ought to be some way to not have the draft quota filled entirely by this year's senior class and the first year group of graduate students, but to spread that quota over the age group in such fashion that we wouldn't have this devastating cutting off of the continuing process."⁸

Inserted into the record of the hearings were a great many letters from university presidents and statements from leading educational associations which Mrs. Green had received. For the most part, these communications urged that selection fall equitably on all ages in the eligible pools rather than solely on the "oldest-first."

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid., p. 527.

⁶ Ibid., p. 542.

⁷ Ibid., p. 523.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 170-71.

Hearings on S. 3098

Hearings on S. 3098 opened March 12, 1868, more than 1 month later than the comparable House hearings. Senator Ralph Yarborough, Democrat of Texas, second-ranking Democrat on the Senate Subcommittee on Education, presided in the absence of the Chairman, Senator Wayne Morse, Democrat of Oregon, who was out of the city that day. The hearings continued for 10 additional days, ending on April 5. The meeting on March 29 was held in Austin, Texas. The record of the hearings was printed in eight parts and consisted of 6,584 pages of testimony, statements, and inserts.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, Commissioner Howe made brief mention of the title IV program. He said that the need for additional college and university teachers was well documented, with enrollments in institutions of higher education expected to expand from six million in 1968 to nine million in 1975. He asserted that approximately 610,000 new full-time equivalent professional staff members would be needed to teach these growing numbers of students.

Title IV came under discussion at two other times during the hearing: first, when Senator William B. Spong, Jr., Democrat of Virginia, appeared before the subcommittee and requested that a larger percentage of the fellowships be allocated to the South; and second, when Hans Rosenhaupt, National Director of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, urged the subcommittee to set aside a certain number of title IV fellowships for candidates chosen in a national competition.

Senator Spong Offers Amendment to Award Fellowships on a State-Population Basis

Senator Spong reviewed the history of title IV, noting the original emphasis on new and expanded doctoral programs. Under these rules, according to Senator Spong, the South fared quite well. After the 1964 amendments to title IV, however, the South's share of the fellowships declined from one-third to one-fourth. He referred to the October 1966 resolution of the Southern Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges which criticized the decreasing percentage of title IV fellowships being allocated to the South.

Senator Spong offered the subcommittee an amendment which he said would require an equitable distribution of the fellowships throughout the States. It would be similar to the distribution requirement in title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the teaching fellowship program. Under the Spong amendment, fellowships would be awarded on a State-population basis whenever at all possible. His amendment would also require the Commissioner of Education to compile annually a list of the number of fellowships which a State would be entitled to under a strict population formula and a list of the number the State was actually awarded. These lists would be distributed to all institutions receiving NDEA fellowships and the in-

stitutions would be encouraged to grant fellowships to students from those States which did not receive their share of fellowships.

Senator Morse, subcommittee chairman, asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to file with his subcommittee a brief memorandum setting forth the Department's position in regard to the Spong amendment. This memorandum which, along with several tables, was inserted into the record of the hearing, stated that "the recommendation that the NDEA Title IV fellowship program be tied to population will impose a rigid formula upon its operations, without regard to student needs."⁹ The memorandum contended that the Spong amendment would cause one of the three legislative objectives of the program to eclipse the other two—which were to assist the better and more rapid preparation of college teachers, and to encourage full capacity of doctoral programs everywhere. It would tie doctoral study to local conditions, whereas Ph. D. production is more of a national enterprise, related first of all to academic capacity for training. The memorandum pointed out that, although support directed to the South had declined on a percentage basis, the South continued to receive a more favorable proportion of the fellowships in relation to the Ph. D.'s it produced than any other region of the country.

Hans Rosenhaupt Urges That a Portion of NDEA Fellowships Be Awarded Through a National Competition

In the followup of the request he made to the Office of Education in the spring of 1967, Hans Rosenhaupt appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Education on April 4, 1968, in support of his recommendation that not more than one-third of new NDEA title IV fellowships be set aside for candidates chosen in a national competition. These fellowships were to be tenable at U.S. graduate schools of the candidate's choice. He said that the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, because of its experience, was admirably suited to serve as a screening device for this purpose. He urged that the Commissioner of Education be given discretionary authority to decide when to start such a national competition since the outlook for appropriations was uncertain at that time. In order to prevent a disproportionate number of the best fellows from congregating at a few prestigious institutions, he recommended that the number of fellowships assigned directly to these institutions, and to be awarded by them, be decreased accordingly.

Senator Yarborough called upon Preston Valien, Deputy Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, to comment on Dr. Rosenhaupt's proposal. Dr. Valien pointed out that with decreased appropriations the Office of Education was unable to meet its commitments for the following year:

"In this past year, the number was cut down to 3,328,

⁹ *Education Legislation, 1968. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Senate, 90th Congress, 2d Session. Part 2. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968. p. 532.*

which was even less than the 4,500 that we had committed, so we had to start an entirely new ball game with institutions, and they understood this, because they realized that we were responding to a national emergency, that we were responding to congressional action. But if we were to go beyond that and not even be able to honor our commitment, and at the same time deprive them of the flexibility of utilizing fellowships that we had originally promised them they would have, I think that the dissatisfaction in the academic community would be monumental and I think that it would be understandable.

"I think that if we had the opportunity to have a national type of graduate fellowship program and we had sufficient fellowships to do this, this might be a worthwhile device, but at the same time I think that we would want to be sure that we had sufficient study of the mechanisms by which we do this rather than have a commitment to do it through a specific arrangement in advance."¹⁰

Inserted into the record of the hearings were a great many letters to Senator Morse written by campus representatives of the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. Almost all of the letters endorsed the Rosenhaupt proposal.

Appropriation for Fiscal Year 1969

The Division of Graduate Programs sought an appropriation of \$106.6 million for fiscal 1969, but the Bureau of the Budget allowed only \$86.6 million, the same amount as had been appropriated for fiscal 1968. The Bureau of the Budget allowance would permit the funding in 1969-70 of approximately 6,000 new fellowships as well as 3,328 fellowships in the second year of tenure and 6,000 fellowships in third year of tenure.

The fiscal 1969 request was transmitted to the Congress under the category of Education Professions Development Activities. In the preceding year, it will be recalled, the title IV appropriation request was listed under Higher Education Activities and every year prior to that year, under Defense Education Activities. The new listing came about as a result of the passage of the Education Professions Development Act in 1967. Although NDEA title IV was not a part of that act, and the Graduate Academic Programs Branch was not a component of the new Bureau of Educational Personnel Development set up in 1967 to administer that act, it logically fit, for appropriation purposes, under the newly established appropriation category of Education Professions Development Activities.

When the Appropriations Bill, H.R. 18037, was reported out of the House Committee on Appropriations on June 20, 1968, it contained an \$80 million appropriation for parts C, D, and E of the Education Professions Development Act (Public Law 90-35), but nothing for title IV of NDEA, as there was at that time no authorization for new NDEA fellowships to be awarded in fiscal 1969.

When H.R. 18037 was reported out of the Senate on July

30, 1968, however, a contingency allowance of \$70 million for title IV was added to Education Professions Development Activities, as explained in the Senate report of the bill:

"The committee recommends \$196,900,000, an increase of \$70,000,000 over the House allowance, a decrease of \$49,013,000 from the budget request, and a net increase of \$33,050,000 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1968. This consists of increases totalling \$49,650,000, offset by a decrease of \$16,600,000. The difference between the committee recommendation and House allowance consists of the \$70,000,000 allowed for the graduate program under title IV of the National Defense Education Act. The House deferred consideration of this item pending its authorization. Since the Senate recently passed the authorizing legislation, the committee has considered the program and included appropriate language making its funding contingent upon final enactment of basic legislation."¹¹

The report stated that under the Senate committee allowance (\$16.6 million less than that allowed the preceding year) the number of new fellowships awarded would be reduced somewhat below the then existing level.

There was no floor discussion in the Senate over the proposed \$70,000,000 allowance for title IV, and when the appropriations bill went to conference the conferees agreed to a \$156,900,000 appropriation for Education Professions Development Activities rather than the \$181,900,000 as proposed by the Senate, but they stipulated that none of the reduction below the Senate proposal should be applied against the amount included therein for title IV of NDEA.¹²

The conference recommendation in regard to appropriation for Education Professions Development Activities was accepted without comment by both the House and the Senate. H.R. 18037 was signed by President Lyndon B. Johnson into Public Law 90-557 on October 11, 1968. As in the appropriation law for the previous year, Public Law 90-557 contained a general provision that no part of the funds appropriated under the act could be used to provide a loan, guarantee of a loan or a grant to any applicant who had been convicted by any court of general jurisdiction of any crime which involved the use of or the assistance to others in the use of force, trespass, or the seizure or property under the control of an institution of higher education to prevent officials or students at such an institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies.

Memorandum of March 8, 1968, to Title IV Coordinators

On March 8, Dean Carpenter sent to all title IV coordinators a memorandum concerning procedures with respect to nomination of fellows for three-year fellowships

¹¹ Report No. 1484. Senate. 90th Congress, 2d Session. July 30, 1968. p. 12-13.

¹² Conference Report No. 1936. House. 90th Congress, 2d Session. October 1, 1968. p. 8.

¹⁰ Ibid., Part 6. p. 2493.

and other recent developments affecting the title IV program.

He reported that most institutions had found it useful to receive tentative acceptance of an NDEA title IV fellowship offer before mailing forms to a prospective nominee. By agreement of members of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, acceptance of a fellowship, traineeship, or assistantschip award before April 15 was to remain tentative and subject to change up to April 15. A student who had accepted such an offer as of April 15 could not resign to accept another offer, except upon written release from the school to which he was committed.

Dean Carpenter informed title IV coordinators that henceforth at least two-thirds of the nominees for new 3-year fellowships should have no more than 1 year of graduate study creditable to their doctoral program. Prior to that time, at least two-thirds of the new fellowships had to go to students who had one-half year or less of graduate study creditable to the degree program.

The final item of the memorandum concerned interruption of tenure for voluntary or involuntary military service. The following policy was announced:

"When tenure as a National Defense Graduate Fellow is interrupted by voluntary or involuntary induction into the military service of the United States, the Fellow should promptly report in writing the date and circumstances of his induction. He should at the same time indicate whether he wishes to have his fellowship considered for reinstatement at the termination of his military service, provided that at least half of a fellowship year remains to be completed at the time of induction.

"The Fellow's statement should be forwarded promptly by the Coordinator to the Graduate Academic Programs Branch with a request that the fellowship resigned by the inductee be handled as a vacated fellowship available for reaward in the usual manner to another student.

"Every effort will be made by the Office of Education to reinstate the fellowship, provided that the request is made (a) within three months of the former Fellow's discharge from military service, and (b) not more than four years after entering military service, and provided that he resumes his studies under the fellowship not later than the beginning of the academic year following by three months his release from active duty.

"The returning veteran should first apply for reinstatement as an NDEA Fellow through the department and institution in which he was enrolled at the time of induction. If the Coordinator at that institution recommends his reinstatement as a Fellow in his former doctoral program, this office will make every effort to reinstate his remaining fellowship tenure as a supplemental award earmarked for his support. If his former institution of doctoral study is unable to take care of him, the returning veteran may then apply for reinstatement of his fellowship tenure through another institution with an approved doctoral program in his major field."

Reason for Clarification of Policy on Interruption of Tenure for Military Service

The policy as announced in the March 8 memorandum concerning interruption of tenure for voluntary or involuntary military service was necessitated by the trends of events in regard to the military draft. In July 1967 the Congress extended the Universal Military Training Act. In extending the act, the Congress did not specify the order in which young men of different ages would be drafted. This determination was to be left for the President to make.

Up through 1967, students enrolled full-time in graduate education were deferred from the draft just as undergraduates were. After the passage of the extension of the draft law in July, the administration took up for consideration the entire matter of draft deferment and age order of drafting young men. Several Federal task forces were set up to study the problem and report to the President. After consideration by the National Security Council of the studies made by the various task forces, the White House announced in February 1968 that students commencing graduate work in the fall of 1968 would no longer be deferred from the draft, not even those in the scientific and engineering fields which up to that time had been considered critical to the national welfare. Undergraduate students, however, would continue to be deferred.

The Selective Service policy in effect at the time of President Johnson's announcement was to draft the older draft-eligible men first. This meant that, with the Vietnam war continuing to require sizable draft quotas each month, young men who were just graduating from college with baccalaureate degrees would become prime targets of the draft. President Johnson chose not to modify existing Selective Service policies, and therefore there was a widespread feeling that graduate school enrollment would suffer a setback in the fall of 1968. It was expected, then, that a much larger number of fellowship holders in 1968-69 might be drafted or choose to volunteer. For this reason the announcement of March 8 was issued, clarifying the rights of former fellows who had completed their military service.

Approval of Reaward of Partial Years of Vacated Fellowships Announced

On March 29, 1968, Dean Carpenter mailed to each title IV coordinator two copies of the *Title IV NDEA Coordinator's Manual for the 1968-69 Graduate Fellowship Program*. In his covering memorandum, he announced that the deadline for institutional applications for 1969-70 fellowships was July 1, 1968, rather than April 15, as in the past.

Dean Carpenter made special mention of several changes that had been incorporated into the new Manual. One of these was that the process for reaward of resigned or terminated fellowships would, with the 1968-69 fellowship year, permit for the first time: (a) substitute and reaward nominations after June 30 and (b) nomination for fellowships which included partial years of vacated fellowship

tenure. Nomination and eligibility requirements for vacated fellowships were to be identical with those for new fellowships. Late nominations which did not meet eligibility requirements were made at the institution's risk.

Dean Carpenter called attention to new policy outlined in the Manual on "Interruption of Tenure for Voluntary or Involuntary Military Service." He emphasized that the student must already have entered tenure as an NDEA fellow registered in the doctoral program of award in order for the provisions to be applicable.

The new Manual also made clear that students who received several consecutive vacated awards would be paid on the same stipend basis as students who had received a 3-year fellowship.

New Policy on Fellowship Stipend Supplementation Announced

On June 28, 1968, just 2 days before the end of his year's stint as head of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch, Dean Carpenter sent to all title IV coordinators copies of the currently issued Department of Health, Education, and Welfare policy statement on supplementation of student stipends. This new policy, issued by the Secretary's Grants Administration Office on May 3, 1968, was applicable to all predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowships administered by the Department. The new statement of policy is quoted:

"Consistent with the philosophy that program objectives should be carried out in a manner which affords maximum discretion to institutions in the exercise of management prerogatives, it is Department policy that institutions should be given the latitude to determine whether supplementation is required and the amounts which are required. Further, institutions should be given the latitude to determine whether such supplementation shall or shall not involve the performance of service. In this connection the Department recognizes that supplementation may be re-

quired to accommodate regional cost of living variations and cases of special need. The Department also recognizes the close interrelationship between teaching and research in the academic environment and encourages its fellows and trainees to undertake teaching or research experience that can contribute meaningfully to their academic training. Any teaching or research experience undertaken by a fellow or trainee supported through the programs of this Department should not significantly prolong the time required for the accomplishment of the training objective for which the award is made.

"Institutions may supplement stipends as necessary from institutional resources. However, no supplementation may be provided from Federal funds unless explicitly authorized under the terms of specific programs and subject to such restrictions as those programs may impose; in any event, no more than \$1,000 of these Federal funds shall be awarded per student per annum. This policy statement is not intended to discourage in any way the use of Federal loan funds.

"Operating agencies of this Department which administer training grant or fellowship programs will assure (1) that institutional requirements for services do not significantly prolong the completion of training supported by this Department and (2) that institutions do not use supplementation as a means of recruitment of students."

The announcement stated that operating agencies which administer training grants or fellowship programs would assure that institutions not use supplementation as a means of recruitment. Institutions were expected to establish formal policies governing the provisions of supplementation and to maintain such reasonable documentation thereof so as to enable Government auditors, project managers, or others who might be reviewing these practices at institutions, to determine whether or not they conformed to established policies.

CHAPTER XIII

first half of eleventh year of operation

July 1, 1968, came and no bill extending the authorization of title IV of NDEA had been passed. This fact created no immediate problem as title IV funds were always appropriated about a year in advance of their actual expenditure—the so-called forward financing feature explained in chapter III. However, the appropriations bill for fiscal 1969 which would provide funds for new fellowships starting in 1969–70 could not contain an appropriation for such new fellowships until the authorizing extension had been passed. Therefore, the passage of substantive legislation extending and amending NDEA was of high priority in the Congress in the summer of 1968.

Substitute H.R. 15067 Reported Out of Committee

On July 8, 1968, H.R. 15067 was reported out the House Education and Labor Committee by Chairman Perkins with amendment. The amendment struck out all of the bill after the enacting clause and inserted in lieu thereof a substitute. The report accompanying the bill noted that 1968 marked

the 10th anniversary of the National Defense Education Act and stated that "over the past 10 years, the National Defense Education Act was proven of invaluable worth to the Nation."¹

As far as title IV of NDEA was concerned, the amended bill was the same as the original bill. The report asserted that the NDEA graduate fellowship program had been a highly successful program for supporting graduate education nationwide and had been achieving its objective of increasing the number of college and university teachers:

"Survey research into the careers of past NDEA fellowship holders indicates that the intent of augmenting college faculties is being well met. While more data and analysis are necessary to provide a detailed picture, it is known that 30.4 percent of the first 5,500 fellows have received their doctorates, and 66 percent of these have entered college and university employment."²

¹ *Report No. 1649*. House, 90 Congress, 2d Session, p. 1.

² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

H.R. 15067, as amended, contained two sections which, although they were not in the part of the bill dealing specifically with title IV of NDEA, had some relevance to it. One was section 1502 dealing with student unrest, which pertained to the various programs of student assistance contained in the bill. This section provided that, if an institution of higher education, after affording notice for hearing to a person attending or employed by the institution, determined that such person (after enactment of the bill) had willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation of the institution and that the refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to the disruption of the institution, the institution could deny further payment to or for the benefit of such person. This provision, however, was not intended to limit a student's freedom of written or oral expression of views or opinions.

Section 1502 further provided that "no loan, or grant under a program authorized or extended by the bill may be awarded to any applicant within 3 years after he has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of the bill, and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, trespass or the seizure of property under control of an institution of higher education to prevent officials or students at such an institution from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies, by an institution or person having knowledge of such conviction."

The other was section 1001 which abolished the Advisory Committee on Graduate Education, which had been established by the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-204), and created in place of it an Advisory Council on Graduate Education. The Advisory Committee on Graduate Education had been created by statute to advise the Commissioner on graduate facilities. The Title IV Advisory Committee, on the other hand, which had for 10 years been advising the Commissioner on the graduate fellowships, had been formed by the Commissioner, not because he was required to do so by law, but because he was permitted to do so.

At the time that the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 were being considered in Congress, a feeling prevailed that throughout the Government there were too many committees. Thus, the new Council was to replace the Advisory Committee on Graduate Education and be given broadened function of advising the Commissioner on all matters of general policy relating to graduate education. The Title IV Advisory Committee would also be superseded under this provision of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968.

The Council was to consist of the Commissioner, who would be chairman, and one representative each from the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office of the President, the National Science Foundation, and the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and of members appointed by the Commissioner from among leading authorities in the field of education, except that at least one of them had to be a graduate student.

The requirement that one of the members be a graduate student was the only change in H.R. 15067 as reported out, compared with H.R. 15067 as introduced.

S. 3769 Reported Out by Senate Committee

As mentioned earlier, the Senate Subcommittee on Education had been holding hearings on S. 3098, a bill identical to H.R. 15067 being considered in the House by the Special Subcommittee on Education. Rather than reporting out an amended bill, as did the House Committee on Education and Labor, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare chose to report out on July 11, 1968, an entirely new bill, S. 3769.

As far as title IV of NDEA was concerned, S. 3769 provided less change in the existing law than did H.R. 15067. S. 3769 proposed to extend the authorization for title IV for 4 additional years, whereas H.R. 15067 as reported out by the Committee, proposed a five-year extension. The only other new provisions proposed to existing law by S. 3769 were that (1) the Commissioner seek to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of graduate programs throughout the Nation, based upon such factors as student enrollments in institutions of higher education and the number of faculty members who had not attained the degree of doctor of philosophy or its equivalent as compared to the number who had such a degree and (2) the Commissioner pay to institutions of higher education, as a cost-of-education allowance for each fellow, such amount as he might determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under other federally supported programs. The provisions of S. 3098 and H.R. 15067 for a fourth-year fellowship in special circumstances and for fellowship stipends to be set in an amount consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs were not included in S. 3769.

In the part of the report commenting on amendments to title IV of NDEA, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare expressed its concern about the distribution of fellowships and institutes in these words:

"The Committee received testimony which indicated that even though the law requires that the benefits of the fellowship programs and institute programs be distributed on an equitable geographic basis, there is evidence that some areas of the country have been receiving fewer grants that the relevant factors for distribution would indicate to be equitable. Therefore, the Committee has included language which sets forth the relevant factors to be considered in the distribution of fellowships and institutes."³

In addition to those amendments specifically directed at title IV of NDEA, there were other provisions of S. 3769 which had significance for title IV. These pertained to the prohibition of duplication of benefits, to student unrest, and to the establishment of an Advisory Council on Graduate Education.

³ Report No. 1387. Senate, 90th Congress, 2d Session, July 11, 1968, p. 36.

In regard to duplication of benefits, under the "cold war GI bill," veterans were precluded from receiving veterans' benefits if they were receiving grant assistance under other Federal education programs. The Senate bill exempted all student assistance programs authorized or amended by the bill from the nonduplication provisions of the Veterans Act.

In regard to student unrest, the Senate bill provided that nothing in the 1968 amendments or in any act amended by the 1968 amendments should be construed to prohibit any institution from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under such acts to an individual because of misconduct which, in the institution's judgment, bore adversely on the student's fitness for such assistance.

S. 3769 contained a provision establishing an Advisory Council on Graduate Education. This provision was the same as that in the House-passed H.R. 15067, except that S. 3769 did not require the Commissioner to be chairman and one member to be a graduate student, as did the House bill.

Senate Passes S. 3769

Although the House Committee on Education and Labor had reported out its Higher Education Amendments of 1968 bill 3 days before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had reported out its bill S. 3769, it was the Senate which, on July 15, 1968, first took Chamber action on the bill, with Senator Wayne Morse as floor manager. Also taken up at the same time was S. 3770, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1968. S. 3769 was considered by the Senate first.

In his introductory remarks, Senator Morse explained that S. 3769, while initiating a few new programs, was mainly concerned with perfecting the statutory authorities for higher education already on the books. He praised the Committee members, both of the majority and the minority, for their cooperation in drafting the bill and reporting it out unanimously:

"Once again I am very pleased to bring to the floor of the Senate a bill that received the unanimous vote of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That does not mean that amendments to the bill will not be offered by some members of the committee, amendments which were considered in committee and turned down by a majority of the committee. There may very well be amendments offered by members of the committee that were not considered in committee. But I am pleased that the committee unanimously approves the format of these two bills."⁴

When it came time for consideration of amendments to S. 3769, Senator Morse explained how the language in the bill relating to equitable geographical distribution of fellowships came about:

"Mr. President, during the hearings of the Subcommit-

tee on Education concerning the proposals for amending our higher education legislation, the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Spong) made an eloquent case for language directing the Commissioner of Education to distribute fellowships under title IV of the National Defense Education Act more equitably. The Senator pointed out that current allocation patterns tended to reinforce the strength of already-strong institutions, at the expense of those institutions with less-developed doctoral capacity. The committee agreed with the Senator that current practices need modifying, and drafted language for inclusion in S. 3769 to assure that fellowships are awarded equitably to all areas of the country.

"The Senator from Virginia (Mr. Spong) recommended that a distribution formula based on State population be inserted in title IV of NDEA. Upon reflection, the committee felt that such a formula would be too restrictive, and would not in all cases truly reflect the Ph. D.-granting ability of the colleges and universities of a State or the college selections of graduate students of all 50 States. Some areas may be populous but lack the necessary graduate institutions to absorb the fellowships that would be allocated to them on a population-based formula; other areas may be sparsely populated but have a university of high caliber which could make important contributions to the development of college teachers. And in the West, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, through interstate agreements, provided educational opportunity for the students of participating States. The committee felt that there was insufficient relationship between general population and degree-granting capacity to justify such a narrow formula.

"However, the committee was equally convinced that some change was necessary to assure equitable allocation of fellowship funds. Therefore, the committee drafted language ordering the Commissioner of Education to allocate NDEA fellowships equitably, and advised the Commissioner to consider two factors in making such allocations: first, college enrollment; and second, lack of Ph. D.-holding faculty members in the colleges and universities of the State. The first factor—college enrollment—is more closely related to a State's need for more college teachers than the State's population at large. The second factor—the ratio of non-Ph. D.-holding faculty members—will act as an equalizing factor, helping to assure that those States whose need for college teachers with the doctorate is the greatest will receive the largest numbers of NDEA fellowships.

"However, I have consulted with the members of the committee, and we have agreed that we could take population as an illustrative factor to be considered as one of the factors in reaching a judgment.

"If the Senator from Virginia, who proposed the population factor, would agree, we wish to propose the inclusion of the term "population." I would be very glad to accept that amendment, if it would be satisfactory to the Senator from Virginia."⁵

⁴ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 114, Part 16. 90th Congress, 2d Session. July 15, 1968. p. 21228.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 21245.

Senator Spong responded by saying that he was pleased that the committee members had reacted favorably to his request, and he thereupon submitted an amendment adding population as one of the factors to be taken into account in the allocation of fellowships. His amendment was agreed to.

Senator Morse explained to the Senators how the provision came about that eliminated the barrier—contained in legislation administered by the Veterans Administration—which precluded benefits under various educational programs to veterans who were exercising their rights under the cold war GI bill of rights:

"The amendment was proposed to us by the hard-working Chairman of the Public Works Committee, the distinguished senator from West Virginia (Mr. Jennings Randolph) who has always been one of our most conscientious Members in looking after the interests of young people.

"As Senators are aware, educational assistance programs are awarded either on the basis of need or as in the case of the Title IV NDEA fellowship program, on the basis of merit. It was our view that if the need exists, the fact that the veteran was receiving certain benefits under the veterans legislation should not preclude the need from being met from other sources. Similarly, to deny benefits such as Title IV NDEA which are conditioned upon merit, by reason of the fact that the veteran had exercised his right to veterans benefits would be to place the veteran in second-class citizenship position."⁶

There was no controversy or debate over any of the provisions of S. 3769. Members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare praised Senator Morse for his leadership in conceiving the legislation and guiding it toward its passage through the Senate. Senator Morse, in turn, cited the unstinting contributions to the Committee's work by each of the members.

The accolade to Senator Lister Hill, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, by Senator Morse deserves mention here as Senator Hill was retiring from the Senate at the conclusion of the 90th Congress and on the Senate side had been the architect, presiding officer at the hearings, and floor manager of the National Defense Education Act when it was originally passed in 1958:

"Now I want to say, before my good friend from Alabama (Mr. Hill) leaves the Chamber—I want the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarborough) to know that our true leader in regard to this legislation is the chairman of the full committee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the incomparable Lister Hill of Alabama.

"Mr. President, talk about mediation and diplomacy in committee work, let me say that the Senator from Alabama is my definition of personified diplomacy, because the leadership he has rendered over these many years on this committee has been unequalled. I do not want to embarrass

him, but I engage in no flattery here. I speak from my heart. I want to say that were it not for the statesmanship and leadership he has displayed for so many years of service to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and serving in the Senate for 30 years, we would not have the record we have made on education legislation. He is the one, more than the rest of us combined, who should get the credit for the accomplishments we are making in the field of education."⁷

S. 3769 was passed by a unanimous record vote. There were 63 yeas, no nays, and 16 not voting.

H.R. 15067 Passed by House

The House took up the Higher Education Amendments bill of 1968, H.R. 15067, for consideration on July 24, 1968. By resolution, debate on the bill was limited to 2 hours. Representative Carl D. Perkins, Democrat of Kentucky, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, was floor manager for the majority, and Representative William H. Ayres, Republican of Ohio and ranking Republican committee member, was floor manager for the minority. Each was recognized by the Chair for 1 hour. In his opening remarks, Mr. Perkins said:

"The legislation is based on 26 days of hearings conducted in 1967 and this year. Many of the provisions in H.R. 15067 are related to recommendations contained in the study of the U.S. Office of Education recently completed by the Special Subcommittee on Education. Many of the student assistance provisions are similar to provisions already approved by the House during its consideration of H.R. 16729. The Special Subcommittee on Education met 17 times in executive session before reporting H.R. 15067 to the committee, and in committee, an additional five executive sessions were held on the bill."⁸

Mr. Perkins stated that legislation was absolutely necessary at that time as there was no fiscal 1969 authorization of appropriations for programs carried under the National Defense Education Act.

In her speech, Representative Edith Green, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Education, praised the bipartisan support given the bill:

"This bill comes to the floor of the House with full bipartisan support. I would express my great appreciation to my colleagues on the subcommittee who have worked many long hours. Each one can be proud of the work he has done—the contributions made toward offering greater educational opportunities.

"Mr. Chairman, this bill was voted out of the subcommittee by unanimous vote and it was also voted out of the full committee by a unanimous vote.

"The consideration of this legislation started during the 90th Congress. During the time that hearings were held more than 120 witnesses appeared before the committee."⁹

⁷ Ibid., p. 21253.

⁸ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 114, Part 18, July 24, 1968. p. 23099.

⁹ Ibid., p. 23104.

⁶ Ibid., p. 21232.

Mrs. Green pointed out in her speech that the bill authorized funds for 2 years and extended programs for an additional 3 years with "such sums as may be authorized by the Congress." In addition to other improvements, she said that the bill provided for a more rational system of advisory committees to assist the Office of Education in carrying out its mission. Resulting from the bill would be a reduction in the number of overlapping advisory committees.

Title IV was not the subject of any substantive comment during the debate on the bill. Representative Patsy Mink, Democrat of Hawaii, did say: "The graduate fellowship program contained in title IV of the NDEA is one of the most effective forms of assistance to scholars and I am pleased to see that the legislation proposes a 5-year extension, authorizing a maximum of 7,500 new fellowships for each year."¹⁰

Only general discussion of the bill took place on July 24. On July 25, the bill was taken up for amendment. No amendments were made to the part of the bill dealing with title IV of NDEA. William J. Scherle, Republican of Iowa, offered a successful amendment in which universities and colleges were required—not just *permitted* as in the bill which came out of committee—to deny benefits to disrupting students.

After all proposed amendments were considered and disposed of, H.R. 15067 was passed by a record vote of 389 yeas, 15 nays, and 28 not voting. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. Perkins then requested immediate consideration of the companion Senate bill, S. 3769. He offered an amendment that struck out all after the enacting clause of S. 3769 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 15067, as passed. His amendment was agreed to, whereupon he asked unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendment and request a conference with the Senate thereon. Hearing no objection, the Chair appointed seven Democrats and five Republicans as conferees.¹¹

Senate Conferees Appointed

The Senate was informed by the House that it had amended S. 3769. On July 27, Senator Robert C. Byrd, Democrat of West Virginia, moved that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, agree to the conference requested by the House, and asked that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate. His motion was

agreed to, whereupon the presiding officer appointed six Democrats and four Republicans as conferees.¹²

Conference Report on S. 3769

Although the Senate passed S. 3769 on July 15, 1968, and the House amended it on July 24, 1968, the Republican and Democratic Conventions in August of 1968 caused a delay in the conferees meeting and agreeing on a conference report. The conference report was not issued until September 25, 1968.¹³

The Senate conferees accepted the following provisions of the House amendment to title IV of NDEA:

1. Increase in the maximum length of a fellowship from three to four academic years in special circumstances.
2. Requirement of reasonable continuing efforts by participating institutions to encourage recipients of fellowships to enter or to continue college teaching.
3. Elimination of the statutory dollar amounts for fellowship programs. Stipends for fellowships already awarded could not be decreased.
4. Provision for a cost-of-education allowance fixed at an amount comparable to other federally supported programs but not to exceed \$3,500 per year for each fellow enrolled.

On its part, the House conferees went along with the Senate in requiring that greater effort be made toward achieving more equitable distribution of graduate programs supported under title IV. The Senate bill directed the Commissioner to seek to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of graduate programs supported under title IV, based on such factors as student enrollment in institutions of higher education, population, and the number of faculty members who had not attained the degree of doctor of philosophy or its equivalent as compared with the number of members who did possess such a degree. The House amendment had no comparable provision.

The conference committee expressed "great concern and distress with respect to the distribution of fellowship programs in the past."¹⁴ The committee declared that it fully expected the Office of Education to take immediate steps to provide for a more equitable geographic distribution of programs supported under title IV. The amendment required the Commissioner of Education to take into account such factors as student enrollments and relative population. The committee further suggested that the Commissioner consider additional factors such as the relative number of faculty members who had not attained the degree of doctor of philosophy as compared with the num-

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 23128.

¹¹ The Democratic conferees were Carl D. Perkins of Kentucky, Edith Green of Oregon, John Brademas of Indiana, Sam M. Gibbons of Florida, Hugh L. Carey of New York, William D. Hathaway of Maine, and Philip Burton of California. The Republican conferees were William H. Ayres of Ohio, Albert H. Quie of Minnesota, Ogden R. Reid of New York, John N. Erlenborn of Illinois, and Marvin L. Esch of Michigan.

¹² The Democratic conferees were Wayne Morse of Oregon, Ralph W. Yarborough of Texas, Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, Jennings Randolph of West Virginia, Harrison A. Williams, Jr., of New Jersey, and Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin. The Republican conferees were Jacob K. Javits of New York, Winston L. Prouty of Vermont, Peter H. Dominick of Colorado, and George Murphy of California.

¹³ Report No. 919. House. 90th Congress, 2d Session. September 25, 1968.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 80.

ber who had attained such degrees. The committee declared that it could not overemphasize the importance it attached to this amendment.

As mentioned before, both S. 3769 and H.R. 15067, as passed by the Senate and House, respectively, provided for an Advisory Council on Graduate Education. The only difference between the bills was that the House amendment required the Commissioner to be chairman of this Council and that one member of it be a graduate student. The Senate receded.

The House conferees also accepted the Senate bill provision exempting all student assistance programs authorized or amended by the bill from the nonduplication provisions of the Veterans Act. The House amendment contained no comparable provision.

In regard to the differing House and Senate provisions dealing with student unrest, the conference report provided that, pertaining to certain specified student assistance programs, including title IV of NDEA:

"If an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending, or employed by, such institution, that such individual has been convicted by any court of record of any crime which was committed after the date of enactment of this act and which involved the use of (or assistance to others in the use of) force, disruption, or seizure of property under control of any institution of higher education to prevent officials or students in such institutions from engaging in their duties or pursuing their studies and that such crime was of serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of the institution, then the institution which such individual attends, or is employed by, shall deny for a period of two years any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c). If an institution denies an individual assistance under the authority of this subsection, then any institution which such individual subsequently attends shall deny for the remainder of the two-year period any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c).

"That if an institution of higher education determines, after affording notice and opportunity for hearing to an individual attending or employed by, such institution, that such individual has willfully refused to obey a lawful regulation or order of such institution after the date of enactment of this act, and that such refusal was of a serious nature and contributed to a substantial disruption of the administration of such institution, then such institution shall deny, for a period of two years, any further payment to, or for the direct benefit of, such individual under any of the programs specified in subsection (c)."¹⁵

The conference report further provided that:

"... nothing in the bill or any act amended by the bill, shall be construed to prohibit any institution of higher

education from refusing to award, continue, or extend any financial assistance under any such act to any individual because of any misconduct which in its judgment bears adversely on his fitness for such assistance: that nothing in the student unrest section shall be construed as limiting or prejudicing the rights and prerogatives of any institution of higher education to institute and carry out an independent, disciplinary proceeding pursuant to existing authority, practice and law: and that nothing in the student unrest section shall be construed to limit the freedom of any student to verbal expression of individual views or opinions."

House Passes Conference Report on S. 3769

On September 26, 1968, Mr. Perkins requested and received unanimous consent to call up the conference report on S. 3769. He was recognized by the Speaker for 1 hour. In his opening remarks, Mr. Perkins said that the conference report affected virtually every higher education program administered by the U.S. Office of Education. He stated that there were well over 100 substantive differences between the House and the Senate version of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. He said that he was pleased to advise the House that in an unusually higher percentage of cases, the differences between the House and Senate bills were resolved in favor of the House position. In other instances, effective and satisfactory compromises were worked out.

In addition to praising all House members of the conference committee, Mr. Perkins paid special tribute to Mrs. Green, Special Subcommittee on Education chairman, and to Mr. Quie, ranking minority member of the subcommittee. Of Mrs. Green, he said:

"Approval today of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 by this House will culminate two years of extensive work by the Committee on Education under the distinguished and competent leadership of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. Green). The legislative history of this landmark legislation is itself a tremendous testament to her legislative skill and to her extensive knowledge and understanding of the strength and needs in American education. The bill was reported from the Special Subcommittee on Education unanimously, from the Committee on Education and Labor unanimously and was approved by the House by an impressive record vote of 389 to 15."

And of Mr. Quie, he said:

"Because of this unified position in large part due to the untiring efforts of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Quie), the House conferees were able to prevail in a majority of the cases."¹⁶

In her speech, Mrs. Green pointed out that the House had accepted a Senate program which provided grants for the improvement of graduate education. The House had no such provision.

¹⁵ Ibid., pp. 83-84.

¹⁶ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 114, Part 22, September 26, 1968, p. 28352.

Mrs. Green explained why the House conferees had objected to the Senate proposal on graduate education:

"We were concerned, too, that in this year of the tight budget, a new program in support of graduate education would only further dilute funds available for already well established programs such as Title IV of the National Defense Education Act. As I am sure every Member of this Congress is aware, it now appears that the appropriation for Title IV will be approximately \$16 million less than it was last year. The practical effect of such a reduction will be that there will be a drastic curtailment in the number of new fellowships which may be awarded.

"There was concern also expressed, very serious concern, about the lack of criteria under which the program was to be administered. The program was not well designed and in a year in which there is an obvious tendency to not fund new programs, it seemed to us that there was little likelihood, if any, of funding this type of program."¹⁷

After several speeches, none of which made reference to NDEA title IV, the conference report on S. 3769 was agreed to by a voice vote.

Senate Passes Conference Report on S. 3769

On October 1, 1968, Senator Yarborough, in the absence of subcommittee chairman Senator Morse, who had been called away to Oregon because of the untimely death of his administrative assistant, requested and received unanimous consent to consider the conference report to S.3769. He also received permission to have inserted into the *Congressional Record* the conference report and the statement of the managers on the part of the House.¹⁸ In his remarks on the report, he described the bill then being considered by the Senate as "a landmark piece of legislation." He said that, as a result of the conference between the House and the Senate, the bill emerging from the conference was in many respects stronger and better than either the Senate-passed or House-passed bill.

Senator Yarborough also received permission to insert into the *Congressional Record* the statement that Senator Morse had prepared on the conference report but was unable to present in person because of his absence. He praised Senator Morse in these words:

"Mr. President, I have a statement of Senator Morse on the higher education conference report. He presided at this conference with great ability. I have never seen a more skilled negotiator and conciliator in my life. He brought together the two Houses in almost 100 points of difference. They were in agreement to the point that every one of the managers of both House signed the report."¹⁹

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 28355. This improvement of graduate education amendment, which was targeted toward increasing the number of centers of excellence in graduate education, authorized \$340,000 to be appropriated for planning purposes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; and \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 1971. No money was appropriated for this program for fiscal 1969 or fiscal 1970.

¹⁸ Ibid., pp. 28974-98.

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 28998.

President Signs S. 3769 into Law

In a ceremony attended by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Wilbur J. Cohen and several Members of Congress, President Johnson on October 16, 1968, signed S. 3769 into Public Law 90-575. On this occasion, he also signed the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 (H.R. 18366) into Public Law 90-576. In his remarks, the President said:

"We believe, that is, you and I, that education is not an expense. We believe it is an investment. The 10 talents multiply. They return in the shape of economic growth. They return in the shape of better government. They return in the shape of a higher standard of living for all of us."²⁰

Following is the exact wording of title IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended by the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968 and earlier amendments:

Public Law 85-864, as Amended, as of October 16, 1968

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEFENSE FELLOWSHIPS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 401. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(20 U.S.C. 461) Enacted Sept. 2, 1958, P.L. 85-864, Title IV, sec. 401, 72 Stat. 1590.

NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS

SEC. 402. (a) During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, the Commissioner is authorized to award not to exceed three thousand fellowships to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, he is authorized to award not to exceed six thousand such fellowships, and during each of the seven succeeding fiscal years, he is authorized to award not to exceed seven thousand five hundred such fellowships. Such fellowships may be awarded for such period of study as the Commissioner may determine, but not in excess of three academic years, except (1) that where a fellowship holder pursues his studies as a regularly enrolled student at the institution during periods outside the regular sessions of the graduate program of the institution, a fellowship may be awarded for a period not in excess of three calendar years, and (2) that the Commissioner may provide by regulation for the granting of such fellowships for a period of study not to exceed one academic year (or one calendar year in the case of fellowships to which clause (1) applies) in addition to the maximum period otherwise applicable, under special circumstances in which the purposes of this title would most effectively be served thereby.

(b) In addition to the number of fellowships authorized to be awarded by subsection (a) of this section, the Commissioner is authorized to award fellowships equal to the number previously awarded during any fiscal year under this section but vacated prior to the end of the period for which they were awarded; except that each fellowship awarded under this subsection shall be for such period of study, not in excess of the remainder of the period for which the fellowship which it replaces was awarded, as the Commissioner may determine.

(20 U.S.C. 462) Enacted Sept. 2, 1958, P.L. 85-864, Title IV, sec. 402,

²⁰ *Public Papers of the President: Lyndon B. Johnson, 1968-69*. Book II. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970. p. 1039.

72 Stat. 1591; amended Oct. 3, 1961, P.L. 87-344 Title II, sec. 203, 75 Stat. 760; amended Dec. 18, 1963, P.L. 88-210, sec. 24(a) (b), 77 Stat. 417; amended Oct. 16, 1964, P.L. 88-665, Title IV, sec. 401, 78 Stat. 1104; amended Oct. 16, 1968, P.L. 90-575 Title III, sec. 311, 312, 82 Stat. 1056.

AWARD OF FELLOWSHIPS AND APPROVAL OF INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 403. (a) Of the total number of fellowships authorized by section 402 (a) to be awarded during a fiscal year (1) not less than one thousand five hundred of such fellowships awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not less than one-third of such fellowships awarded during the eight succeeding fiscal years shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) the remainder shall be awarded on such bases as he may determine, subject to the provisions of subsection (c). The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

(1) that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded, and

(2) that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the Nation, and

(3) that the application contains satisfactory assurance that the institution will make reasonable continuing efforts to encourage recipients of fellowships under this title, enrolled in such program, to teach or continue to teach in institutions of higher education.

(b) The total of the fellowships awarded as described in clause (1) of subsection (a) for pursuing a course of study in a graduate program at any institution of higher learning may not exceed a limit established by the Commissioner in the light of the objective referred to in subsection (a) (2), and the Commissioner shall give consideration to such objective in determining the number of fellowships awarded under this title for attendance at any one institution of higher education.

(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are interested in teaching, or continuing to teach, in institutions of higher education and are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree.

(d) No fellowship shall be awarded under this title for study at a school or department of divinity. For the purposes of this subsection, the term "school or department of divinity" means an institution or department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

(e) In order to provide training opportunities in those areas of the Nation which have greater need for increased numbers of highly qualified persons to teach in institutions of higher education, the Commissioner shall seek to achieve an equitable geographical distribution of graduate programs approved under this section throughout the Nation, based upon such factors as student enrollments in institutions of higher education and population.

(20 U.S.C. 463) Enacted Sept. 2, 1958, P.L. 85-864, Title IV, sec. 403, 72 Stat. 1591; amended Oct. 16, 1964, P.L. 88-665, Title IV, sec. 402(a) (c), 78 Stat. 1104; amended Oct. 16, 1968, P.L. 90-575, Title III, secs. 311, 312, 314, 82 Stat. 1056.

FELLOWSHIP STIPENDS

SEC. 404. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to persons awarded fellowships under this title such stipends (including such allowances

for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

(b) The Commissioner shall (in addition to the stipends paid to persons under subsection (a)) pay to the institution of higher education at which such person is pursuing his course of study such amounts as the Commissioner may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs, except that such amount shall not exceed \$3,500 per academic year for any such person.

(20 U.S.C. 464) Enacted Sept. 2, 1958, P.L. 85-864, Title IV, sec. 404, 72 Stat. 1591; amended Dec. 18, 1963, P.L. 88-210, sec. 24(c), 77 Stat. 417; amended Oct. 16, 1964, P.L. 88-665, Title IV, sec. 403, 78 Stat. 1105; amended Oct. 16, 1968, P.L. 90-575, Title III, sec. 313, 82 Stat. 1056.

FELLOWSHIP CONDITIONS

SEC. 405. A person awarded a fellowship under the provisions of this title shall continue to receive the payments provided in section 404 only during such periods as the Commissioner finds that he is maintaining satisfactory proficiency in, and devoting essentially full time to, study or research in the field in which such fellowship was awarded, in an institution of higher education, and is not engaging in gainful employment other than part-time employment by such institution in teaching, research, or similar activities, approved by the Commissioner.

(20 U.S.C. 465) Enacted Sept. 2, 1958, P.L. 85-864, Title IV, sec. 405, 72 Stat. 1591.

Max Goodrich Appointed Chief of Graduate Fellowship Program

Max Goodrich, a physicist, took a one-year's leave of absence from his position as Dean of the Graduate School of Louisiana State University, to become the tenth man to head the graduate fellowship program. He took up his new duties in the first week of July 1968 in replacement of Dean David Carpenter who returned to Washington University in St. Louis.

George B. Lane, who had been serving as Assistant Chief of the Graduate Academic Programs Branch, transferred in July of 1968 to the staff of the Federal Interagency Committee on Education located in the Office of the Secretary of the Department. He was replaced as Assistant Chief of the Branch by Lawrence W. Friedrich, former Graduate Dean of Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis., who had joined the Branch in the summer of 1967 as a Regional Coordinator.

Progress Reports Reviewed During Summer

By the deadline date of August 1, a total of 2,891 program progress reports and 626 applications for new program approvals under title IV were received by the Graduate Academic Programs Branch. An additional 75 institutional departments which had been reorganized during the year sought approval of their new status. Because of the limited amount of funds available for salaries and travel expenses, only 39 consultants were to be employed in the fall—a considerably smaller number than in immediately preceding years—and they were to review only the applications for new approvals and reorganized departments.

Therefore, the task of reviewing progress reports of ongoing programs, which were generally less detailed than new applications, was assigned for the most part to the four regional coordinators who accomplished this work by the end of September.

Certain Title IV Policies Clarified

Dean Goodrich sent his first memorandum to title IV coordinators on September 12, 1968. First he called attention to a congressional amendment to the fiscal year 1968 appropriations act for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which prohibited payment of Federal funds to any individual convicted of an offense related to riot or group activity resulting in property damage or personal injury. A copy of the amendment was enclosed. Since NDEA title IV fellows would begin receiving funds under this appropriations act in September 1968, Dean Goodrich requested that any conviction of a fellowship holder in this respect which came to the attention of an NDEA title IV coordinator should be reported to the Branch at once. He made it clear that the civil protection of fair notice and due process would be respected in every instance.

The memorandum stated that resignations from NDEA title IV fellowships for the purposes of military induction or enlistment were being received. In order to establish the planned reinstatement rights, however, title IV coordinators were reminded that the fellow should submit to the Branch, through the coordinator, documentary evidence confirming his date of entry upon active duty in the armed services. Whenever this date occurred during the fellow's entitlement period, the Office of Education expected to be able to reinstate him upon his discharge from military service. The policy of reinstatement was to apply as well to duly authorized conscientious objectors.

Dr. Goodrich also informed title IV coordinators that if a fellowship was vacated prior to the beginning of an academic year and not filled at the beginning of the first term of the academic year, the institution could reaward the fellowship for the remaining whole term(s) of that fellowship year (relinquishing the unused portion of that fellowship year with respect to the fellow's stipend but not with respect to the institution's educational allowance) or if it wished, it could elect to leave the fellowship vacant for the entire year and reaward the full year of the unused fellowship the following academic year. The beginning of the academic year (or any term) was defined as the first day of classes as given in the university calendar.

In regard to the June 28, 1968, memorandum regarding the Department's new policy on supplementation, the following interpretations were announced:

"(1) Funds which an institution receives from a federal agency are considered federal funds, for supplementation purposes, only if they are subject to audit by a federal audit agency. Educational allowance funds are not subject to such audit.

"(2) Employment of a Fellow during tenure at the institution where the award is held or in an outside intern-

ship supervised by the Fellow's own department and training institution will be presumed not 'to significantly prolong the time required' to earn the degree provided such employment is approved as educationally relevant by the Fellow's department and the graduate dean, and provided such employment does not exceed one quarter time. Work not regularly a part of the degree program should be compensated at normal departmental rates. Coordinators are urged to restrict employment to persons who have completed the first year of graduate study in the department in which the fellowship is held."

Reinstatement of Fellowships to Persons Other than Military

In a memorandum dated October 9, 1968, Dean Goodrich informed title IV coordinators that the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 and its accompanying regulations indicated that men who were commissioned officers of the Public Health Service or of the Environmental Science Services Administration were considered to be fulfilling their military obligation. Because of that, the Graduate Academic Programs Branch was endorsing the policy of providing the same reinstatement protection for these officers that it meant to provide to men who entered military service.

Dean Goodrich wrote that similar protection had been requested of some agencies by VISTA and Peace Corps volunteers. Since the Selective Service System did not view such voluntary activity as substitution for military service, the Office of Education would not accord the same reinstatement privileges to these persons as it accorded to veterans of military service.

Consultant Panelists Conduct Annual Review on October 14-16, 1968

On October 14-16, 39 consultants convened at the Office of Education to review 626 applications for new programs (333 submitted for the first time and 293 resubmitted after disapproval), 75 applications from departments with approved programs which had undergone reorganization during the year, and 25 progress reports which regional coordinators had deemed to need the further review of expert panelists.

The charge given the panelists was the same as that given in previous years:

"(a) Identify departments of high quality, or potential quality, for fellowship assistance. . . .

"(b) Reject weak or declining departments and those without prospects for development within the foreseeable future.

"(c) The program must produce college teachers. The Office of Education supports many fields generally considered to be professional in character, but each has justified support in view of its record in producing higher education faculty."

Followup Memorandum Issued Concerning Resignations for Entry into Military Service

In a followup memorandum dated November 27, 1968, Dean Goodrich reviewed for sake of emphasis the previously announced policies concerning resignations for entry into military service. By way of clarification, he wrote that there had to be a reasonable relationship between the date of resignation and the date of entry into active military duty, normally not more than three months. Also, fellows who could satisfy their military commitments in six months did not need to resign but should request an interruption of tenure in their fellowship.

Title IV Advisory Committee Meeting of November 18 and 19, 1968

All members except one attended the Title IV Advisory Committee meeting of November 18-19, 1968. In addition, Joseph Young, Executive Director of the recently created National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, was in attendance as an observer during the first day.

The opening session was chaired by J. Wayne Reitz, Director of the Division of Graduate Programs, and included welcoming and introductory remarks by Peter P. Muirhead, Acting Deputy Commissioner of Education, and Preston Valien, Acting Associate Commissioner for Higher Education. Mr. Muirhead addressed himself to the current problems existing in higher education, such as inclusion of disadvantaged groups in graduate training, new means of Federal support for the improvement of graduate programs, and methods of balancing current financial support among science and nonscience fields. Dr. Valien's remarks included a summary of the new programs established by the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, and the impact and role of each in graduate education.

Both Dr. Valien and Mr. Muirhead expressed appreciation to the Advisory Committee for past and current efforts to assist in the administration and development of the NDEA title IV program. Henceforth the Committee would assemble only on an ad hoc basis because the Education Professions Development Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-35) had created an Advisory Council for Graduate Education to assume the policymaking role for all graduate programs in the Office of Education.

Policy Matters

Most of the first day was devoted to a number of policy considerations. One question was whether or not to consider the summer term the same as any other term of the academic year with respect to interruption of tenure; henceforth fellowships were to be awarded on a 12-month basis rather than on an academic-year basis. The Committee recommended that the optional characteristic of attendance at summer school be preserved and that the student not be called upon to justify his nonattendance at summer

session. The Committee also felt that first-year fellows should be permitted to start in summer rather than being required to start at the beginning of the academic year, as in the past.

The Committee noted the clear desire of Congress, as expressed in the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968, that NDEA title IV fellows be strongly encouraged to enter college teaching careers. In view of this, the Committee urged that the Office of Education stress even more than it had in the past the value to fellows of guided teaching experience. It recommended that an item concerning teaching experience be included on the new rating sheets for new applications in the same manner as in progress report rating sheets of the current competition.

The Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968 authorized fourth-year fellowships in special circumstances. In regard to the factors to be considered in selecting and distributing these fellowships, the Committee recommended that criteria for selection of awardees include successful completion of course work, orals, and approval of the dissertation topic. The graduate dean, it was recommended, should be responsible for providing a list of nominees in priority order based upon the ability of the fellows and the likelihood of their completing their doctorates in 1 year. These nominations were then to be forwarded to the Graduate Academic Programs Branch for a national competition in March of each year. During the competition equitable consideration would be given to geographic and other pertinent factors in distributing the awards.

Because of the current growing interest in aiding the disadvantaged the Committee was asked to discuss possibilities of increasing the number of fellowships to students from minority groups. The consensus of the Committee was to include wording in the Coordinator's Manual to reflect Office of Education support for award of title IV fellowships to disadvantaged students.

The Committee made very plain its opposition to supplementation of first-year graduate students and approved the following statement with the hope that it would be forwarded to the Commissioner of Education and the Federal Interagency Committee on Education:

"With the existing limitation of funds to support students in graduate school, the Advisory Committee of Title IV urges the continuation of its policy prohibiting the supplementation of basic Federal stipends to Fellows who have not completed the first year of graduate work.

"We further urge that other Federal agencies adopt this practice and that all agencies move to increase their stipends when budgetary resources warrant it.

"And we further urge the Congress to appropriate funds sufficient to attain the authorized level of Title IV fellowships."

Allocation of Fellowships for 1969-70

After policy matters had been disposed of, the Committee proceeded to allocation of fellowships. Since attempts by the Branch to restore the cut from \$86.6 million to \$70

million for the title IV program had failed, it was possible to allocate only 2,905 fellowships to institutions for 1969-70. This compared with 3,328 new fellowships available the previous year.

The Committee agreed to a ceiling of 38 fellowships for any institution, down seven from the previous year. Also, whereas the minimum number allocated for 1968-69 had been two, the new minimum for 1969-70 was one fellowship. Because of the larger cutback in fellowships than was expected, it was decided not to admit any new institutions to the title IV program in 1969-70, although 22 of them had applied and some of their program applications had been approved by the panelists. To do so would have required even more drastic cuts in the allocations to institutions already participating in the program.

In regard to applications from new institutions, the Advisory Committee was asked if the guidelines should provide for making ineligible institutions which had not awarded a doctorate and departments within doctorate-granting institutions which had not produced doctorates. The Committee recommended that an appropriate statement be inserted in the program application guidelines to alert institutions which had not awarded a doctorate that they should apply only if cogent evidence of a strong doctoral program could be supplied. In the case of a new departmental application from an institution which already had one or more approved programs, the institution, the Committee recommended, should demonstrate its financial commitment to the program and steps it had taken to insure the production of college teachers. The program, however, should be reviewed in relation to the total graduate program of the institution.

Council of Graduate Schools Holds Session on 10th Anniversary of Title IV

At its Eighth Annual Meeting in San Francisco on December 4-6, 1968, the Council of Graduate Schools in the

United States held a session commemorating the 10th anniversary of title IV of NDEA. Moderated by J. P. Elder, the first director of the title IV program, the program featured the following presentations: "Historical Survey," by J. Wayne Reitz, current Director of the Division of Graduate Programs, Office of Education; "Reminiscences of a Pseudo-Bureaucrat," by Henry E. Bent, Chief of the title IV program in 1959-60; and "NDEA in its Tenth Year," by Richard L. Predmore, Chief of the title IV program in 1966-67.

Notification of Awards Sent to Members of Congress and to Institutions

On December 18, 1969, an official notification was sent to Members of Congress showing the number of new fellowships for 1969-70 that had been allocated to each institution and the approved programs in which these fellowships could be used. The covering memorandum stated that 2,905 new 3-year fellowships had been allocated to 198 institutions for use in 3,199 approved programs. These 198 institutions, down one from the previous year, represented all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Of the 3,199 approved programs, 43 percent were in the humanities, social sciences, and education; 57 percent were in the biological sciences, physical sciences, and engineering.

Two days later, on December 20, Dean Goodrich sent a letter to institution presidents informing them of their approved programs and allocations of new fellowships for 1969-70. As in the immediate past years, he again requested that, insofar as possible, two-thirds of the new fellowships go to fellows in the humanities, social sciences, and education areas.

This is the concluding section of the account of the operation and legislative history of the NDEA title IV program from 1958 through 1968.

CHAPTER XIV

loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit controversy

It was mentioned in chapter II that the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in reporting its version of the NDEA bills (S. 4237), had included a section, 1001(f), providing that no part of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under NDEA could be used to make payments under any scholarship, fellowship, or grant to any individual unless such individual (1) had executed and filed with the Commissioner of Education an affidavit stating that he did not believe in, was not a member of, and did not support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods and (2) had taken an oath of allegiance to the United States.

Section 1001(f) received little attention when S. 4237 was being discussed on the Senate floor. The only time it came up for discussion at all was when Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican of South Dakota, offered an amendment that would change the provisions of section 1001(f) to apply

to the recipients of loans as well as to those receiving grants. Senator Lister Hill, manager for the Committee bill, said he knew of no opposition to the proposed amendment. It was agreed to without objection.¹ The companion House bill (H.R. 13247), which had already passed the House, did not contain this provision. In conference the Senate conferees prevailed, and section 1001(f) was not mentioned during final floor discussion of the bill in either the House or the Senate.

Since title IV fellows received Federal payments, they were required, like other receiving payments under NDEA, to take an oath of allegiance to the United States and sign the disclaimer affidavit. Therefore, an account of the controversy over this provision of NDEA is necessary if this history of title IV through 1968 is to be complete.

¹ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 104, Part 13. 85th Congress, 2d Session. August 13, 1958. p. 17320.

1959 Attempt to Repeal Section 1001(f) of NDEA

Soon after the passage of NDEA, Members of the Congress began to receive considerable protest about section 1001(f). As early as November 1, 1958, the influential American Association of University Professors sent to each member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the House Education and Labor Committee a letter vigorously urging repeal of the provision. Seven liberal arts colleges even refused to participate in NDEA because of it. The American Council on Education, the Association of State Universities, and the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities all went on record in opposition to the disclaimer oath.

Senate Subcommittee Hearings on S. 819

Because of the growing opposition to provision 1001(f), Senator John F. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts, later to become the 35th President of the United States, introduced on January 29, 1959, for himself and Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, a bill (S. 819) to repeal this provision. S. 819 was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Over in the House seven similar bills were introduced in the House and referred to the Education and Labor Committee.² The chairman of this House Committee, Representative Graham A. Barden, Democrat of North Carolina, during hearings on February 19, 1959, on the administration of NDEA, declared, "I shall resist with everything that is within me the removal of that provision."³ No doubt this strong statement is explanation enough that there were no hearings on any of the seven bills which had been referred to his committee.

The Senate Subcommittee on Education, with Senator Kennedy acting as chairman, conducted hearings on S. 819 on April 29 and May 5. Testimony was heard from several Members of the Senate, Representative Edith S. Green, and leading educators. Secretary Arthur S. Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare also testified in favor of the bill, and a letter from Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, concurring with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in recommending approval of S. 819, was printed in the record of the hearings.⁴ Numerous letters received from college and university administrators and chapters of the American Association of University Professors urging repeal of section 1001(f) were also included in the record of the hearings.

² These bills were introduced by Democrats James Roosevelt of California, James C. Oliver of Maine, Edith S. Green of Oregon, Byron L. Johnson of Colorado; and Republicans Peter Frelinghuysen, Jr., of New Jersey, John V. Lindsay of New York, and Fred Schwengel of Iowa.

³ *Administration of NDEA. Hearings Before Subcommittees of the House Committee on Education and Labor. 86th Congress, 1st Session.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. pp. 26-27.

⁴ *Amending Education Act of 1958. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. p. 86.

All except one of the witnesses testified in favor of the bill as it existed. The lone dissenter was Senator Mundt who made it plan that he would go along with the repeal of the disclaimer oath only if suitable substitute safeguards were enacted in lieu thereof:

"I would not like Congress to repeal what you have done in this one Act and then appear so naive that we leave nothing at all as a safeguard to those hundreds of millions of honest American patriotic taxpayers who understandably do not want to see even a single dollar of their money spent under the guise of national defense education to help Communists or communism."⁵

Although Senator Mundt was the only witness to appear against outright repeal of section 1001(f), debate on the Senate floor in July of 1959 revealed that he had support for his position from a considerable number of other Senators as well as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the American Farm Bureau.

S. 819 Reported to the Senate

On June 29, 1959, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, by a vote of 12 to 3, reported S. 819 favorably without amendment.⁶ The report stated that experience had shown section 1001(f) to be ineffective as a security device and harmful to the NDEA program.

Republican Senators Barry M. Goldwater of Arizona, Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, and Winston L. Prouty of Vermont, however, filed a minority report in which they said they would go along with the majority on repeal of section 1001(f) but that when the bill came up on the Senate floor they intended to offer amendments, which, while superseding the existing affidavit requirement, would impose penalty on any individual who accepted Federal benefits while advocating the overthrow of our constitutional form of Government by illegal means.

Senate Begins Debate on S. 819

On July 21, 1959, the Senate made as its unfinished business the consideration of S. 819, but no debate on it occurred that day. Heated, lengthy debate took place, however, during much of the time that the Senate was in session during the following 2 days.

In his opening remarks as floor manager and chief spokesman for the bill, Senator Kennedy clearly defined the issues that would be discussed during the 2 days of debate:

"The difference of opinion between us today is as to whether there should be a substitute, whether the language contained in the bill should be repealed and no substitute provided, or whether the substitute suggested by the Senator from South Dakota should be included in the proposed legislation."⁷

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁶ *Report No. 454. Senate. 86th Congress, 1st Session. June 29, 1959; and Congressional Record. Vol. 105, Part II. 86th Congress, 1st Session. July 23, 1959. p. 14099.*

⁷ *Ibid.*, July 22, 1959. p. 13988.

During the debate, the following arguments were advanced in favor of repeal of section 1001(f) of NDEA and against repeal.

Summary of Arguments in Favor of Repeal of Section 1001(f)

1. Oaths of belief or disbelief are repugnant, especially in a free democratic society. The disclaimer requirement or "test oath" by its very nature cannot fail to be invidious. If an individual refuses to sign, it raises a question that he is unworthy of public trust or benefit. If he signs, he endorses the pertinency of the general suspicion about him and his kind which is embodied in the requirement. Senator Stephen M. Young, Democrat of Ohio, expressed it this way:

"Our educators and institutions of learning have no objection to a positive oath—one in which they declare they will uphold and support the Constitution and the laws and the ideals of the Nation.

"They do object, and rightfully so, to this negative loyalty oath. By implication it assumes a fact, the fact of disloyalty, which must be disproven by the applicant. It is like requiring a man to swear that he will quit beating his wife before he can be hired—this in spite of the fact there is no evidence whatsoever that he ever beat his wife. Would any dignified American submit to a requirement of this kind?"⁸

Several speakers contended that the "test oath" was contrary to Anglo-Saxon tradition. Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican of Kentucky, quoted and put into the record as a representative expression of the deep-seated feeling held by those who opposed the disclaimer affidavit, testimony given during the Senate hearing on S. 819 by Dr. Hugh Borton, President of Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania:

"In fact, it was largely because restrictions had been placed on thought and belief by the governments of the countries in which they were living that many of our forefathers left England and Europe to settle in the American colonies. It is not surprising, therefore, that practices such as thought control and brainwashing which unfortunately have become prevalent in other parts of the world during the past two decades, are so abhorrent to us. Thus my first objection to the act is that it appears to be contrary to our basic principle of freedom of thought. The act assumes that the Federal Government has a right to make a person's belief a condition of participation in the use of the funds provided under the act."⁹

2. Students are singled out and treated unfairly in comparison to other classes of citizens, such as beneficiaries of the farm program, the Federal housing program, and the social security program who also receive Federal benefits and yet do not have to take oaths as are required of students.

3. Even positive oaths, such as the oath of allegiance,

begin to lose their impact and significance if required to be given too frequently or in a perfunctory manner. Senator Eugene J. McCarthy, Democrat of Minnesota, in a speech described by Senator Kennedy as the best he had ever heard on the subject, put it this way:

"The taking of an oath traditionally has been surrounded by a formal ritual reflecting the solemnity of the occasion and the importance of the act, both to the individual who takes it and also to the community in the service of which it is taken.

"The purpose for which the oath is taken has an important bearing on the nature of the oath. In my opinion, it seriously lowers the dignity of the oaths when it is used in a routine manner, as a mere step in the paperwork of making a loan, as a trivial step, perfunctorily taken and perfunctorily administered."¹⁰

4. The disclaimer affidavit had caused seven colleges and unknown numbers of students to refuse to participate in the NDEA program. There was no known instance, up to that time, where a university refused to participate in the graduate fellowship program because of section 1001(f). More important, though, was the fact that the great amount of hostility which the disclaimer oath had generated was harmful to relations between the Federal Government and the education community, thus detracting from what was otherwise considered a generally forward-looking and worthwhile act. A common additional complaint was that, in the case of the loan program, the oaths had to be administered, and the necessary paperwork done, by the colleges and universities themselves.

5. There was question concerning the constitutionality of section 1001(f) on the ground that it was vague and indefinite to such a degree that it offended the due process clause of the fifth amendment.

6. Section 1001(f) was in reality unnecessary. There were sufficient existing laws whereby subversives could be apprehended and prosecuted. A letter from HEW Secretary Flemming was put into record, stating that the NDEA benefits in question were not a right to be demanded by any individual but that the Commissioner of Education could, in the administration of the act, simply refuse to award benefits to known subversives. Furthermore, it was believed that a Communist would not have any scruples about taking the required oaths, and it was anticipated that actually very few Communists would be caught by this means and convicted.

Summary of Arguments Against Repeal of Section 1001(f) Without Suitable Safeguards

1. Democratic Senators Richard B. Russell of Georgia and Spessard L. Holland of Florida, and others, saw no good reason why any loyal, patriotic American should resent taking an oath of allegiance to the United States and declaring his or her hostility to philosophies destructive to our Government. In fact, in their opinion, most

⁸ Ibid., July 23, 1958. p. 14072.

⁹ Ibid., p. 14074.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 14080.

good American citizens would welcome the opportunity to express their loyalty.

2. The menace of subversion had not abated but was ever present. Therefore, it was necessary to maintain some means of preventing Communists or other subversives from obtaining U.S. funds for education to learn better how to destroy the United States Government. It was primarily for this reason that the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the American Farm Bureau were against repeal of section 1001(f) without adequate substitute safeguards. According to Senator Mundt, students were special targets of Communist subversion:

"Unfortunately, one of the targets of the Communist conspiracy in the United States is obviously American youth. In the main, American youth has been able to resist communism successfully. On the other hand, the college campus is one place where the Communists operate to get their clutches on young, growing Americans. I think that we must keep in mind that the Senate today is confronted with a serious situation."¹¹

3. In answer to opponents who claimed that students were unfairly singled out and discriminated against in comparison to other classes of recipients of Federal aid who did not have to take oaths of allegiance or sign disclaimer affidavits, those who were against outright repeal of section 1001(f) repeated the point again and again that NDEA was a "national defense" act. This, they said, constituted a very important difference.

Senator Holland stressed this point of view when he said during the debate:

"I ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts if he does not feel that, with the purpose so carefully confined to the defense field as is this law, in the case of young people whose skills and capabilities are thought to lend themselves to the service of our Nation in this important field, it would not be inappropriate, in furtherance of such an objective, and in seeking to train young people to help defend our Nation, to require them to defend their hostility to philosophies which are destructive of our Government, and to require them to take an oath of loyalty which is in consonance with the oaths taken by others who are either in the Reserve components, the National Guard components, or various other security forces of our Nation?"¹²

Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican of New York, who voted along with the majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to repeal section 1001(f), admitted that the repeal attempt was considerably complicated by the fact that "we have tied this aid to higher education into our national defense."¹³

4. The language in section 1001(f) of NDEA was identical to that pertaining to fellowship grants in the National Science Foundation Act of 1950. In 9 years of

operation of the Foundation not one complaint had been received by Congress about that provision.

5. Reports of a preponderance of dissatisfaction with section 1001(f) were greatly exaggerated. Several Senators stated that they had had little or no mail on the subject and that the dissenters actually represented only a small vocal minority of the education community.

Amendments to S. 819 Offered

With the issues clearly drawn, the debate proceeded on an uneven course. During debate on the first day, Senator Kennedy said that he didn't object to students taking the oath of allegiance. He objected to their filing an affidavit affirming that they were not members of the Communist Party. He stated that the witnesses at the subcommittee hearings at which he presided were divided on the need for, or desirability of, requiring a student to take an oath of allegiance.

Also on the first day of the debate, Senator Mundt offered an amendment which was to be a substitute for the existing section 1001(f). It provided that any individual who was or who had been a member of any organization determined by the Attorney General—in conformity with Executive Order 10450, dated April 27, 1953—to be totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, would be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year and 1 day, or both, if such individual received any payment or loan under the act. On the next day Senator Mundt modified his amendment to take into account suggestions of Senators Russell and Goldwater which included reinsertion of the loyalty oath. This provision did not appear in the original Mundt amendment.

In order to dramatize what he considered discrimination against students, Senator Clark later proposed an amendment to the modified Mundt amendment, which would make its provisions apply equally to any individual—including farmer, homeowner, mortgagee, or member of a cooperative entitled to assistance under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936—who received Federal payments. When Senator Clark found that Senator Mundt would not go along with such an amendment, and it was hopeless, he withdrew it.

After more lengthy debate, Senator Javits offered an amendment, which he likewise later modified, as a substitute for the Mundt amendment. The final form of the Javits amendment simply required that any individual receiving payments under the act take an oath of allegiance to the United States, with criminal penalties to be imposed for perjury. The Javits amendment was approved by a vote of 46 to 45.

S. 819 Recommitted to Committee

On several votes relating to the amendments which had been offered, the division between yeas and nays was rather close, indicating a lack of unanimity on what kind of a bill there should be, if any. This fact prompted Sen-

¹¹ Ibid., July 22, 1959. p. 13993.

¹² Ibid., pp. 13990-91.

¹³ Ibid., July 23, 1959. p. 14090.

ator Russell B. Long, Democrat of Louisiana, to move to recommit S. 819 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"It seems to me that when the loyalty, the security, and the safety of the Nation are involved, if the Senate can come no nearer to agreeing than to decide the issue by a margin of a single vote, it is evident that sufficient consideration has not been given to the issue, because certainly there is no division among us on the question of our desire to protect the Nation. Thus, it is obvious that further consideration of the pending measure is required."¹⁴

Senator Long's motion was accepted by a vote of 49 to 42, thus in effect killing the bill for the first session of the 89th Congress.

1960 Attempt to Repeal Disclaimer Affidavit

After the Senate recommitted S. 819 to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on July 23, 1959, the pressure on the part of the education community for repeal of the disclaimer affidavit continued to mount. For this reason Senator John F. Kennedy, for himself, Senator Joseph S. Clark, and Senator Jacob K. Javits, introduced on January 28 (legislative day, January 27, 1960) a bill—S. 2929—to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 by repealing the disclaimer affidavit provision of the act. Specifically, S. 2929 provided that section 1001 of NDEA be amended by striking out subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form:

"I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

Thus, S. 2929 was different from its unsuccessful predecessor, S. 819, in that it sought to repeal only the disclaimer affidavit. S. 819 sought to eliminate the loyalty oath as well. The loyalty oath was retained in S. 2929 no doubt because of the strong feelings about its retention as expressed by a number of Senators in the debates of 1959. After its introduction in the Senate, S. 2929 was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2929 Favorably Reported From Committee

No hearings were held on S. 2929, and after discussion, considered as limited by the opponents of the bill, the full committee, by a vote of 11 to 4, ordered it favorably reported on February 2, 5 days after its introduction.¹⁵ The arguments put forward by the majority of the committee

in favor of repeal of the disclaimer affidavit were the same as those voiced in 1959.

"The committee believes that the disclaimer affidavit is not effective as a security device, impedes the education process, reflects unnecessarily and undeservedly on members of the educational community and unjustly discriminates against the needy student. Moreover, at a time when the Nation's reliance on the educational community is increasing and the ties between the university and Government are getting closer, it is most undesirable to continue a situation which is productive only of friction and suspicion. The committee concurs in the opinion of an overwhelming majority in the educational community that the disclaimer affidavit should be eliminated."¹⁶

The report quoted President Eisenhower's recommendation in his January 18, 1960, budget message urging repeal of the provision of NDEA that prohibited payments or loans to any individual unless he executed an affidavit affirming that he did not believe in, or belong to, any organization teaching the illegal overthrow of the Government.

In the report there was also a letter to Senator Hill from Philip S. Hughes, Assistant Director for Legislative Reference, Bureau of the Budget, stating that the National Science Foundation, in its report to the committee, had recommended repeal of this affidavit and that the Bureau of the Budget concurred with both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation in repeal of the affidavit requirement.

Also in the report were the names of 18 institutions which had withdrawn from the student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit; eight institutions which had declined to participate in the student loan program because of the disclaimer affidavit; and 85 institutions, many of them very large, whose presidents or boards had publicly stated their disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit but which had continued to participate in the student loan program.

The report contained the names of the following associations and organizations which had protested the disclaimer affidavit:

- American Association for the Advancement of Science
- American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities
- American Association of University Professors
- American Civil Liberties Union
- American Council of Learned Societies
- American Council on Education
- American Jewish Congress
- Associated Students of Sacramento State College (California)
- Association for Higher Education (National Education Association)
- Association of American Colleges
- Association of American Universities

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 14100.

¹⁵ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 106, Part 10, 86th Congress, 2d Session, June 15, 1960, p. 12652.

¹⁶ Report No. 1347, 86th Congress, 2d Session, February 2, 1960, p. 7.

Association of Graduate Schools
 National Council of Churches of Christ
 National Conference on Higher Education
 National Education Association
 National Student Association
 New England Society of Newspaper Editors
 State Universities Association

Minority Views

Senators Everett M. Dirksen, Barry Goldwater, and Norman Brunsdale (Republican of North Dakota) placed in the report a joint minority statement in which they announced their intention to offer on the floor an amendment to the proposed legislation, making it a crime for anyone who was a Communist or a member of a subversive organization, knowing it to be subversive, to accept any benefits under NDEA. They had offered such an amendment in committee but it was rejected.

The three Senators said they thought it was strange that during the hearings in 1959 on repeal of the disclaimer affidavit and loyalty oath, not a single student was called to testify to give the committee his or her views on the pending legislation, even though the loyalty oath requirement applied only to the student. They interpreted the failure of any student to testify in protest of the loyalty requirement as evidence of the fact that the students were not unduly offended by the requirement.

The three Senators also argued that students were not being discriminated against by the requirement. NDEA was a "National Defense Act," they pointed out, not just a general aid-to-education statute. They said, "It is perfectly clear that this act would never have been adopted had not the words 'national defense' been contained in its title."

Individual View of Senator Prouty. Senator Winston L. Prouty, Republican of Vermont, inserted into the report accompanying S. 2929 his individual views. He said that in committee he had offered an amendment which would make it a crime for any individual to accept benefits under NDEA while belonging to an organization determined by the Attorney General to be a totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive organization. His amendment, which required neither the signing of any affidavit, nor the taking of any oath, was rejected by the committee. Therefore, when S. 2929 came to the floor of the Senate, he said, he intended to propose a substitute which would eliminate complaints of those who believed that affidavits and oaths were objectionable, yet would at the same time protect the interests of the United States by making it a crime for anyone to accept grants or loans under the defense education programs while belonging to subversive groups.

S. 2929 Debated in the Senate

On June 15, 1960, Senator Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, then Senate Majority Leader, moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1411, Senate Bill

2929. The motion was agreed to. Senator John F. Kennedy, as he did in connection with S. 819 in 1959, served as floor manager for the proponents of S. 2929.

The battle lines were about the same and the arguments advanced pro and con were similar to those of the previous year. The opponents to S. 2929 berated the committee for reporting out a bill—which they claimed was almost identical to the one they had recommitted to the committee the previous year for further study—only 5 days after it had been introduced and with no hearings held on it.

The proponents claimed that, by far, the majority of the higher education community, as indicated in the report of the bill, were in favor of repealing the disclaimer affidavit. Opponents disputed this claim. Senator Goldwater said that when he took a count of the institutions whose faculties expressed disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit, his calculation gave him 131 institutions which (1) never participated in NDEA, (2) had participated but had withdrawn, or (3) had participated and never withdrawn, but whose presidents or faculties had objected to the disclaimer affidavit requirement. Since, he said, there were approximately 1,300 institutions of higher education in the country, the dissenters constituted only about 10 percent of the total number, which he argued could not be considered an overwhelming percentage.¹⁷

Senator Richard B. Russell and several other Senators criticized what they considered arbitrary and discriminatory action by colleges which refused to participate in the NDEA programs. They argued that these colleges were denying the students, who were the ones to take the oath and sign the affidavit, the right to make the determination themselves. Thus the colleges were in effect preventing students from making loans to continue their education.

In his speech in favor of repealing the disclaimer affidavit, Senator Prescott Bush, Republican of Connecticut, received permission to insert into the *Congressional Record* the article, "Loyalty: An Issue of Academic Freedom," by A. Whitney Griswold, President of Yale University, which had appeared in the *New York Times* magazine December 20, 1959.¹⁸ This article was referred to by several speakers. The proponents of S. 2929 considered the article a good expression of their viewpoint on the issue being discussed.

At the request of Senator Gale W. McGee, Democrat of Wyoming, a resolution of March 1, 1960, urging repeal of the disclaimer affidavit by the Western Association of Graduate Schools—an organization comprising 49 graduate schools—was inserted into the *Congressional Record*.¹⁹

Senator Prouty Offers His Amendment

After a number of proponents and opponents of the bill had had an opportunity to state their views, Senator Prouty offered his amendment as promised:

¹⁷ *Congressional Record*, Vol. 106, Part 10, 86th Congress, 2d Session, June 15, 1960, p. 12653.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 12654-56.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 12686.

"It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That subsection (f) of section 1001 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 581) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) (1) No person may apply for or receive any grant, payment, or loan under this Act while he is a member of the Communist Party or any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the establishment, control, conduct, seizure, or overthrow of the Government of the United States, or the government of any State, or political subdivision thereof, by the use of force or violence, and has knowledge of such purpose or objective of that party or other organization.

"(2) No person who within five years has been a member of the party or any organization of the kind referred to in paragraph (1) may apply for or receive any grant, payment or loan under this Act unless his application for such grant, payment, or loan is accompanied by a written statement, executed under oath, containing a full and complete disclosure of the facts concerning his membership in that party or other organization and the knowledge possessed by him during the period of his membership therein with regard to the purposes and objectives thereof.

"(3) Whoever knowingly violates paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: 'A bill to amend section 1001 (f) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.' " ²⁰

After some discussion on the Prouty amendment, Senator Kennedy said that he could accept it as a substitute for his own bill which, of course, he still would have preferred. He realized that a compromise was necessary to get a bill through both the Senate and the House:

"My judgment is that if we accept the language of the Senator from Vermont, we will have a better chance of carrying this effort through to successful completion this year. After all, our objective is not merely action in the Senate, but by the House also." ²¹

Until Senator Kennedy said that he would accept the Prouty amendment, Senator Prouty had indicated to the Senate that he would speak for three or four hours. He had done a great deal of research on the subject. When he discovered that his amendment would be agreed to, he changed his mind about speaking and instead inserted his prepared speech into the *Congressional Record*. The lengthy insertion took up 15 pages. ²²

The substance of Senator Prouty's statement was that neither the existing section 1001 (f) of NDEA nor the proposed language of S. 2929 was satisfactory. His amendment, he felt, should be agreeable to both sides because, under its provisions, no one would have to sign a disclaimer affidavit or take an oath and, at the same time,

Communists and subversives would be prevented from securing Federal payments. He maintained that legislation requiring the loyalty oath alone, as proposed in S. 2929, would be ineffectual. He stated that he had presented questions to the Department of Justice and the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress, and that they had both replied that the oath was practically worthless as a protective device—a person could not be convicted under it, not only if such person became a Communist after taking the oath but even if the person was a Communist at the time of taking the oath. ²³

Senator Prouty contended that college youth were principal targets of Communist subversion and cited Bureau of Customs data to the effect that over a 12-month period in 1959, according to a spot check, at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States were processed through the port of New Orleans. Since there were approximately 40 points of entry and New Orleans was one of the lesser of these from the standpoint of entry of Communist propaganda, he maintained that upward of 12 million packages of such materials were going to American educational institutions. ²⁴ In further support of his contention, he quoted from a national magazine article written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation:

"Being good tacticians, the Communists realize that one concealed party member in education may be worth a dozen in less strategic fields, and some of their more successful propagandists in this area have influenced and are influencing, the ideas of thousands of young people." ²⁵

Senator Prouty also stated that, contrary to the contentions of proponents of S. 2929, the majority of college and university presidents were in favor of the affidavit requirement of NDEA. He cited a survey conducted by the American Federation of Teachers. ²⁶

Senate Passes S. 2929 with Prouty Amendment

Since most Senators expected Senator Prouty to go ahead with his announced intention of speaking three or four hours, many of them had left the floor, planning to return in time for voting. When Senator Kennedy announced that his side would accept the Prouty amendment, Senator Thomas J. Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, strongly urged that the loyalty oath be retained in the bill. Senator Kennedy agreed to this also, and Senator Dirksen asked Senator Prouty if he would change his amendment from one being offered as substitute to one being offered as an addition to S. 2929. Senator Prouty said that he would, and the Senate, without a quorum, by a voice vote passed S. 2929, as amended.

When several Senators returned, expecting to find Senator Prouty still speaking, they were surprised to find that

²⁰ Ibid., p. 12665.

²¹ Ibid., p. 12669.

²² Ibid., pp. 12670-86.

²³ Ibid., p. 12679.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 12673.

²⁵ Ibid., p. 12672.

²⁶ Ibid., p. 12680.

final action had taken place. One of these, Senator Spessard L. Holland, Democrat of Florida, made a motion to reconsider the vote. His motion was put on the Calendar for the next day. After about a half hour's debate the following day clarifying what had taken place the previous afternoon, and restating positions on the bill, Senator Dirksen moved to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which S. 2929 had been passed. Senator Dirksen's motion was agreed to.

S. 2929 Dies in the House

S. 2929 then went to the House of Representatives where it was referred on June 17 to the Committee on Education and Labor. This committee had also received a bill, H.R. 10182, introduced by Representative Thomas L. Ashley, Democrat of Ohio, on February 4, 1960, which would remove from NDEA the requirement that each student file an affidavit stating he did not believe in or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence.²⁷

The Subcommittee on Special Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor met on June 22, 1960, on the proposed legislation to repeal the disclaimer affidavit of NDEA and heard Dr. Nathan Pusey, President of Harvard University. The subcommittee adjourned subject to the call of the Chair. No further hearings or action were taken on S. 2929, and the bill died with the adjournment of the 86th Congress on September 1, 1960.

1961 Attempt to Remove Disclaimer Affidavit

When John F. Kennedy became President in 1961, it was a foregone conclusion that further attempts would be made to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit requirement from NDEA since President Kennedy as a Senator had led the fight in the 1959 and 1960 attempts. However, since the whole act was up for consideration for amendment in 1961, a separate bill to eliminate the disclaimer clause was not introduced on behalf of the administration but rather a provision to do this was made part of the administration's bills. S. 1726 and H.R. 6774. These two bills simply provided for an oath of allegiance in place of the existing requirements under section 1001(f).

Several other bills were introduced in the House and Senate in 1961 which, like the administration's bills, would remove the requirement under section 1001(f) of NDEA that each student who received a payment or loan had to file an affidavit stating he did not believe in or advocate the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. Senator Prescott Bush, Republican of Connecticut, Representative Edith S. Green, Democrat of Oregon, and Representative John V. Lindsay, Republican of New York, introduced bills whose sole purpose was to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit, while the bill introduced by Representative Roman C. Pucinski, Democrat of Illinois, in-

cluded elimination of the affidavit as one of many provisions amending the National Defense Education Act.

Portion of 1961 NDEA Amendment Hearings Dealing with the Removal of the Disclaimer Affidavit

The 1961 hearings on amendments to NDEA took place during 2 days in May in the Senate and 10 days in June in the House. A considerable part of the hearings was devoted to the discussion of whether or not to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit. A large number of witnesses testified both for and against the removal of the requirement.

Subcommittee Chairmen Oppose Disclaimer Affidavit. Both Mrs. Green, who chaired the House Special Subcommittee on Education, which conducted the hearings on the higher education titles of NDEA, and Senator Morse, who chaired the Senate Subcommittee on Education, were in favor of eliminating the disclaimer affidavit. In addition to the bill, H.R. 368, which she had introduced on January 3, 1961, Mrs. Green had introduced a bill in 1959 to abolish section 1001(f) and had also testified in support of S. 819 in May of 1959 during the Senate Subcommittee on Education hearings conducted by Senator John F. Kennedy. She also inserted into the record of her subcommittee hearings a large number of letters and resolutions which she had received in opposition to the disclaimer affidavit.

Senator Morse had not taken an active role in the 1959 and 1960 attempts to abolish the disclaimer affidavit requirement, but he made his position on the matter clear when Francis W. Stover, Director, National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, appeared before his subcommittee in favor of retention of section 1001(f) of NDEA:

"I want to thank you very much, Mr. Stover, for your testimony. Of course, I think, as you know, I do not agree with the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in regard to the affidavit. I think that the oath of allegiance to our country, which all of us take when we come into the Senate, is adequate, and I happen to be one of the co-authors, as you know, of the law now on the books which makes membership in any organization that is subversive or seeks to overthrow the Government by force to be illegal. I respectfully suggest that the Department of Justice ought to get busy and see to it that law is enforced, because when you come to set out a separate group just because they happen to be students seeking to borrow money under an act such as this, and require them to take an oath, which you do not generally require, you lose me. But I have a great deal of respect for your point of view. I understand the point of view. I am not saying that there is no merit in it. It just becomes a matter of judgment."²⁸

Commissioner McMurrin Urges Repeal of Disclaimer Affidavit. Commissioner of Education Sterling M. McMurrin

²⁷ There were also seven bills hanging over from the first (1959) session of the 86th Congress on which no hearings had been held. See page 129.

²⁸ *National Defense Education Act. Hearings Before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Senate. 87th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1961. pp. 172-73.*

was questioned by Representative John M. Ashbrook, Republican of Ohio, early in the hearings as to why he was quirement. Commissioner McMurrin replied:

recommending elimination of the disclaimer affidavit re-

"I am of the opinion, and my colleagues in the Office of Education are of the opinion, and the administration is of the opinion, that the oath of allegiance which is to be found in the act as a requirement is sufficient to indicate the degree of allegiance of a person to the Nation and we feel that the disclaimer affidavit adds nothing whatsoever to the capacity of the Government to determine that allegiance; that the oath in itself is satisfactory; that the disclaimer contributes nothing and in turn singles out a certain segment of our population for a requirement that is ordinarily not imposed on other persons."²⁹

Representative Frank Thompson, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, was against the disclaimer affidavit requirement and was not aware of its inclusion in NDEA when it was passed in 1958:

"Now, I am ashamed to have to admit publicly that I did not know of the existence of the disclaimer clause until after the conference report had been adopted, the legislation signed, and it was the law."³⁰

But Representatives Roman C. Pucinski, Dominick V. Daniels, Democrat of New Jersey, and Robert P. Griffin, Republican of Michigan, seemed to favor its retention even though Mr. Pucinski's bill provided for its elimination. Mr. Pucinski suggested that the solution to the dilemma was "to remove the oath of allegiance since we presume every citizen is loyal to this country and include a disclaimer because there is a fundamental difference between these two."³¹ Mr. Griffin stated that he had gone into one of the teachers colleges in his State and learned from the person administering the loan program that not one student had complained about the disclaimer affidavit.³²

When Mr. Daniels asked Dr. McMurrin how many colleges and universities had refused to participate in the NDEA program because of the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit, Dr. McMurrin called upon Peter P. Muirhead, Director of the Financial Aid Branch of the Office of Education. Mr. Muirhead stated that 32 schools were not participating in the student loan program, of which 12 had not participated at any time and 20 had participated at one time but had withdrawn.³³ In addition, there were 61 institutions whose presidents or boards had stated their disapproval of the disclaimer affidavit but which continued to participate in the student loan program. Mr. Muirhead provided the following list of institutions (dated May 17, 1961) which was inserted into the record of the hearings:

INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE WITHDRAWN FROM THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM BECAUSE OF THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

- *Amherst College (Massachusetts)
- *Antioch College (Ohio)
- *Bennington College (Vermont)
- *Brandeis University (Massachusetts)
- *Georger College (Maryland)
- *Grinnell College (Iowa)
- *Harvard University (Massachusetts)
- Interdenominational Theological Seminary (Georgia)
- *Mount Holyoke College (Massachusetts)
- *Oberlin College (Ohio)
- *Radcliffe College (Massachusetts)
- *Reed College (Oregon)
- *St. John's College (Maryland)
- *Sarah Lawrence College (New York)
- *Smith College (Massachusetts)
- *University of Chicago (Illinois)
- Vassar College (New York)
- Wesleyan University (Connecticut)
- *Wilmington College (Ohio)
- *Yale University (Connecticut)

INSTITUTIONS WHICH DECLINED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM BECAUSE OF THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

- Beloit College (Wisconsin)
- Bryn Mawr College (Pennsylvania)
- Colby Junior College (New Hampshire)
- *Haverford College (Pennsylvania)
- *Mills College (California)
- *Kenyon College (Ohio)
- *Putney Graduate School of Teacher Education (Vermont)
- Newton College of the Sacred Heart (Massachusetts)
- *Princeton University (New Jersey)
- *Swarthmore College (Pennsylvania)
- Wellesley College (Massachusetts)
- *Illinois College of Chiropractic and Foot Surgery

INSTITUTIONS WHOSE PRESIDENTS OR BOARDS HAVE STATED THEIR DISAPPROVAL OF THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT BUT WHICH CONTINUE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

- Bates College (Maine)
- Bethel College (Kansas)
- Bluffton College (Ohio)
- Bowdoin College (Maine)
- *Brown University (Rhode Island)
- Case Institute of Technology (Ohio)
- City College of New York (New York)
- Colby College (Maine)
- Fairleigh Dickinson University (New Jersey)
- Florida Presbyterian College (Florida)
- Gustavus Adolphus College (Minnesota)
- Hamilton College (New York)
- Indiana University (Indiana)
- Iowa State Teachers College (Iowa)
- Jacksonville University (Florida)
- Kansas State University (Kansas)
- Lafayette College (Pennsylvania)
- Lake Erie College (Ohio)
- Lake Forest College (Illinois)
- La Verne College (California)

NOTE.—An asterisk indicates these institutions have filed or expressed an intention of filing provisional applications for participation in 1961-62, the proviso being that the disclaimer affidavit be repealed.

²⁹ *National Defense Education Act*. Hearings before the Joint Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 12.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 14.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 104.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 93.

Lawrence College (Wisconsin)
 Manchester College (Indiana)
 Northwestern University (Illinois)
 Pratt Institute (New York)
 Queens College (New York)
 Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (New York)
 Rhode Island College of Education (Rhode Island)
 Roosevelt University (Illinois)
 Rutgers University (New Jersey)
 St. John's University of Minnesota (Minnesota)
 St. Olaf College (Minnesota)
 Colgate University (New York)
 College of St. Benedict (Minnesota)
 Columbia University (New York)
 Cornell University (New York)
 Dartmouth College (New Hampshire)
 Duke University (North Carolina)
 Earlham College (Indiana)
 Elmira College (New York)
 State University of Iowa (Iowa)
 Temple University (Pennsylvania)
 Tufts University (Massachusetts)
 University of Arizona (Arizona)
 University of Colorado (Colorado)
 University of Connecticut (Connecticut)
 University of Detroit (Michigan)
 University of Hawaii (Hawaii)
 University of Illinois (Illinois)
 University of Iowa (Iowa)
 University of Minnesota (Minnesota)
 University of New Hampshire (New Hampshire)
 University of North Carolina (North Carolina)
 University of Notre Dame (Indiana)
 University of Oregon (Oregon)
 University of Pennsylvania (Pennsylvania)
 University of Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania)
 University of Rhode Island (Rhode Island)
 University of Rochester (New York)
 University of Washington (Washington)
 University of Wisconsin (Wisconsin)
 Western College for Women (Ohio)
 Worcester Polytechnic Institute (Massachusetts)

Most of the opposition to the disclaimer affidavit had developed from the student loan program because this program involved a large number of higher educational institutions which had to put up 10 percent of the loan money and were responsible for administering the provisions of section 1001(f) to a great number of students. In the graduate fellowship program, on the other hand, the fellow was responsible for getting the oath and affidavit notarized and mailed to the Office of Education. The first time that the Office of Education received official notification of a refusal to participate in the graduate fellowship program was in the fall of 1960 when the Philosophy of Education Committee at Boston University, which had made application and received fellowships under title IV for 1960-61, indicated that it would not apply for fellowships for 1961-62 because of the disclaimer affidavit, with which it disagreed in principle.

Other Witnesses Testify. Because of the thorough discussion of the loyalty oath and disclaimer provisions of NDEA in the 1959 and 1960 debates in the Senate, no new arguments for or against repeal of section 1001(f) were

advanced in the 1961 hearings. Except for two student associations, essentially the same groups restated their previous positions. Spokesmen for the leading educational associations—such as the American Council on Education, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, the Association for Higher Education, and the American Association of University Professors—reiterated their previously stated reasons why the disclaimer affidavit requirement should be eliminated.

Also, spokesmen for the American Civil Liberties Union, the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO), and the American Veterans Committee, the latter claiming to represent 25,000 members, testified in support of elimination of the disclaimer affidavit. Andrew J. Biemiller of the AFL-CIO argued, as had others during the two years of controversy over the issue, that the Congress should remove the disclaimer requirement for the same reasons that in 1959 it removed a similar requirement that was contained in the Taft-Hartley Act.

"We did not believe that the proposal (the disclaimer affidavit) should have been in the bill when it passed in 1958 any more than we believe that the proposal should have been in the Taft-Hartley Act when it was passed in 1947. This committee, in its wisdom, saw fit as one of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin Act to do away with the non-Communist affidavit, and we think exactly the same logic applies to the Defense Education Act. We think that it is an insult to the people involved to ask them to take such an oath."³⁴

Supporting retention of section 1001(f) as written in the existing law were the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, claiming to represent about 1,300,000 members, the American Legion, and the American Farm Bureau. They argued that it was not the students, who had to take the oath and do the signing, who were doing the complaining but rather the college presidents and professors.

One of the arguments used by opponents of change in section 1001(f) of NDEA during the 1959 and 1960 Senate debates was that the students had not been heard from, and they, of course, were the ones who were directly affected. So in the 1961 hearings on NDEA amendments, spokesmen for two student organizations representing opposing viewpoints were invited to testify.

Richard Rettig, president of the United States National Student Association, (USNSA) testified on behalf of his organization, which he said was a confederation of elected student governing groups representing the student bodies of 390 colleges and universities with an enrollment in excess of 1,200,000 students in 46 States and the District of Columbia.

He stated that in December of 1958 the National Executive Committee of USNSA had made a resolution urging repeal of section 1001(f), and that the 12th National Student Congress in 1959 and the 13th National Student Congress in 1960 had upheld this action. Furthermore, he said,

³⁴ Ibid., p. 298.

USNSA was opposed to the Prouty amendment which had been added to S. 2929 in 1960, for the following two reasons:

"(1) No standard is included in the legislation of S. 2929 which defines the meaning of the Communist Party or any other organization having for one of its purposes or objectives the seizure or overthrow of the Government of the United States, and

"(2) Without such standard, extremely severe restrictions are placed upon an individual's right to association at a very early age, in such a manner as to effectively discourage the freedom of inquiry and freedom of expression." ³⁵

Testifying in opposition to the point of view espoused by USNSA was Douglas Caddy, National Director, Young Americans for Freedom, which he said was an organization founded nine months before and consisting of an estimated 27,000 members, about two-thirds of whom were college students. He asserted that "repeal of the affidavit currently required for college students participating in the act would be a serious blow to the internal security of the United States and would, moreover, provide a psychological victory to the enemies of the American way of life." ³⁶

Mr. Caddy was challenged on this statement by Representative John Brademas, Democrat of Indiana, who pointed out that both President Kennedy and former President Eisenhower had urged repeal of section 1001(f). Mr. Brademas asserted it was inconceivable that these two men, in the highest position of responsibility in the Government, would recommend an action that would endanger the security of the country. Mr. Caddy replied that he was basing his assertion on the statements made on the floor of the Senate in 1960 by Republican Senator Styles Bridges of New Hampshire, and Democratic Senators Strom Thurmond of South Carolina and Spessard L. Holland of Florida. ³⁷

Mr. Caddy declared in his testimony that contrary to the popularly held notion, the vast majority of American students were in favor of retention of the nonsubversive affidavit. He was questioned closely on this assertion by Representative Robert N. Giaimo, Democrat of Connecticut, who wanted to know where he got his data. Mr. Caddy admitted that no poll had been taken of all college students on this issue, but he said that this was the conclusion one arrived at by reading college newspaper editorials and by going to various newspaper editor conventions, student body president conventions, and other meetings that drew college students. His prepared statement, which was inserted into the record of the hearings, contained statements by six college and university presidents and four professors who urged retention of the affidavit.

Section 1001(f) Provisions of H.R. 7904

In the summer of 1961 both the House and the Senate reported out clean bills, H.R. 7904 and S. 2345, in place of the administration bills, H.R. 6774 and S. 1726, which had been earlier introduced on behalf of the administration and had been the principal focus of the hearings.

The new House bill eliminated the disclaimer affidavit by substituting a new section 1001(f), which used the exact language of S. 2929 as amended by the Prouty amendment on the floor of the Senate in 1960.

The report of the bill to the House stated that "the so-called disclaimer affidavit is replaced with a stronger anti-Communist provision. The committee found that the provision requiring students to sign an affidavit disclaiming any membership or affiliation with any subversive organization was ineffectual and discriminatory." ³⁸

Although six Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee presented in the House report of the bill minority views opposing some of the provisions of H.R. 7904, there was no opposition expressed against the proposed new section 1001(f).

Section 1001(f) Provisions of S. 2345

S. 2345 proposed to add to NDEA a new title X, "Strengthening School Library Resources Needed for Teaching and Learning." The old title X, "Miscellaneous Provisions," became title XI, and section 1001(f) of the original NDEA would become 1101(f) under the bill. Following is the wording of the new section 1101(f):

"(f)(1) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.' The provisions of section 1001 of Title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation.

"(2)(A) When any Communist organization, as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, is registered or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization with knowledge or notice that such organization is so registered or that such order has become final (1) to make application for any grant, payment, or loan which is to be made from funds part or all of which are appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under the authority of this Act, or (2) to use or attempt to use any such grant, payment, or loan.

³⁵ *National Defense Education Act*. Senate hearings of 1961, op. cit., pp. 205-06.

³⁶ *National Defense Education Act*. House hearings of 1961, op. cit., p. 786.

³⁷ Senator Thurmond later left the Democratic Party and became a Republican.

³⁸ *Report No. 674*. House. 87th Congress, 1st Session. July 6, 1961. p. 3.

"(B) Whoever violates subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall be fined not more than \$10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The report of the bill to the Senate stated:

"This amendment would carry out the recommendation of President Kennedy. In 1960 President Eisenhower made the same recommendation. The majority of the committee share the views expressed by two successive administrations and by virtually every educational organization that the disclaimer affidavit provision is unnecessary and carries with it an unwarranted implication that students' and teachers' loyalty is suspect.

"However, the committee has provided that if a member of a communist organization, as defined in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, with knowledge or notice that such organization is registered or under final order to register which is no longer subject to appeal, applies for or uses any loan, grant, or payment from funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this act, he will subject himself to criminal prosecution and upon conviction be liable to a fine of not more than \$10,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

"This penalty is in addition to any other penalties which might be inflicted under other statutes.

"It is not the intent of the committee that by this additional provision in title XI any duty is imposed upon either institutions or the Commissioner to initiate or carry on investigations of individuals. Rather it is the intent of the committee that notice be given to individuals applying for awards or other payments of the existence of this provision of the Act."³⁹

In their "Minority Views" to the committee report to the Senate, Republican Senators Barry Goldwater of Arizona and John G. Tower of Texas found the proposed new section 1101(f) unsatisfactory:

"The committee was in agreement that the existing provision requiring an oath of allegiance by each recipient of a benefit under the Act should be retained but that the non-Communist disclaimer affidavit should be repealed. Disagreement came on the question of finding a substitute for the disclaimer affidavit. A small minority favored repeal without substitution. The great majority favored alternative provisions but disagreed on what they should be."⁴⁰

The two Senators said that they were pleased that "the committee recognized the need for protecting the national security against the receipt of Federal benefits by members of the Communist Party, a party wholly devoted to the overthrow of the American government and bent on aiding the Soviet Union to achieve world conquest and total domination." But they were most disappointed that the committee had rejected the amendment offered in committee by Senator Prouty, one which the Senate had passed in identical form in June 1960 during the 86th Congress.

They found the provision of the committee bill defective in two respects. First, they maintained it weakened the necessary safeguards by eliminating, entirely, the disclosure requirement of the Prouty amendment. But even more important, by linking the provision to the Subversive Activities Control Act, they felt that a serious risk was being created that the committee proposal might ultimately be declared to be unconstitutional. They pointed out that the Communist Party argued that the entire registration scheme, when the penalties and disabilities were included, constituted a veiled attempt to outlaw the Communist Party, which if attempted by direct means would clearly be unconstitutional. Furthermore, they said that there was serious question as to whether the registration requirement of the Subversive Activities Control Act did not involve the unconstitutional element of self-incrimination, which four Supreme Court justices held it did.⁴¹

No Floor Action Taken on Either H.R. 7904 or S. 2345

As a result of the labors of both the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, bills were reported to their respective Chambers which would eliminate the controversial disclaimer affidavit. However, for reasons discussed in detail in chapter V, both bills became casualties of the fight over Federal aid to public school construction and public teacher salaries and Federal loans to private schools. Thus, neither bill reached the floor of its respective Chamber and in the waning days of the first session of the 87th Congress, a 2-year extension of NDEA was passed, with section 1001(f) of the original act unchanged.

Disclaimer Affidavit Requirement Removed in 1962

Four years of effort in attempting to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit requirement from NDEA was finally brought to a successful conclusion in October of 1962. It will be recalled that in 1959 the effort failed when a bill (S. 819) reported out of committee was recommitted by the Senate to the committee. In 1960 a bill (S. 2929) passed the Senate in amended form and died in the House. In 1961 both House and Senate committees reported out bills (H.R. 7904 and S. 2345) which would have eliminated the disclaimer affidavit, but neither bill reached the floor of their respective Chambers.

Although there had been opposition all along to any change in section 1001(f) of the original NDEA, it became apparent as time went on that forces in favor of removal of the disclaimer affidavit requirement were becoming the majority and that in due time Congress would take the necessary action. It is interesting, however, that the final action did not come about as an original piece of legislation whose purpose, or part of whose purpose, was to amend section 1001(f).

³⁹ Report No. 627. Senate. 87th Congress, 1st Session. July 31, 1961. p. 42.

⁴⁰ Ibid., pp. 128-29.

⁴¹ Ibid., p. 130.

Question Raised Concerning a National Science Foundation Fellowship Award

It all started back in June 1961 when a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, on June 8, advised the House that one Edward Yellin, a graduate student at the University of Illinois, had been awarded a graduate fellowship at that University in the amount of \$3,800 by the National Science Foundation on March 15, 1961. Yellin had appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in February 1958; had refused to answer questions propounded by the committee; had previously been identified under oath by two witnesses before that committee as a member of the Communist Party; on June 30, 1958, was cited for contempt of Congress in the Federal district court at Hammond, Ind.; and on March 9, 1960, was sentenced to serve 1 year in jail and was fined \$250. An appeal was then pending in the Supreme Court of the United States.

On June 15, 1961, at hearings held before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, which had legislative oversight of the National Science Foundation, witnesses representing the Foundation testified that Yellin was awarded a graduate fellowship by the National Science Foundation on March 15, 1961; that at the time the award was made the Foundation had no knowledge of the difficulties in which he had been involved; that a few weeks after the award had been made a member of the staff of the House Committee on Un-American Activities brought to the attention of the Foundation facts relating to Yellin's refusal to answer questions asked of him by that committee in February 1958, and his subsequent conviction for contempt of Congress. Additional testimony disclosed that, as interpreted by the National Science Foundation, the legislative mandate with respect to fellowships required that they be awarded "solely on the basis of ability" and it was therefore the interpretation of the Foundation that only an applicant's ability could be taken into account. "As we read the act," said Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the Foundation, "there is no other interpretation we can make because those are the terms laid down."⁴²

Proposals Made to Amend National Science Foundation Act of 1950

On June 21, 1961, Representative Overton Brooks, Democrat of Louisiana and Chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, introduced a bill, H.R. 7806, to amend the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to provide additional criteria for selection of persons for scholarships and fellowships and to require additional information on the affidavit filed by each applicant for a scholarship or fellowship.

⁴² *Awards of Fellowships and Scholarships Under the National Science Foundation Act*. Hearings Before the Committee on Science and Astronautics. House. 87th Congress, 1st Session. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. p. 30.

At resumption of hearings on July 20, 1961, Dr. Waterman declared that the Foundation viewed the amendments proposed by H.R. 7806 "with deep concern." Principally, the officials of the Foundation were disturbed by the prospect of the necessity of investigating fellowship applicants on a substantial scale. "Moreover," Dr. Waterman said, "in any case where a question arises with respect to the character or loyalty of an applicant, the Foundation would be required to make essentially judicial determinations which are inappropriate for such an agency."⁴³

As a result of the objections raised by the Foundation to H.R. 7806, Mr. Brooks introduced on August 8, 1961, a new bill, H.R. 8556, which had been drafted in cooperation with Foundation officials. H.R. 8556 was passed by the Science and Astronautics Committee on August 15, 1961, by a vote of 14 to 1, and reported out of committee to the House on August 24. The purposes of H.R. 8556 were:

(1) to eliminate the disclaimer affidavit required by section 16 of the National Science Foundation Act;

(2) to add a new provision making it a crime for any member of a Communist organization, as defined in the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, to apply for or use any scholarship or fellowship awarded under the provisions of section 10 of the act;

(3) to require each applicant for scholarship or fellowship to provide the National Science Foundation with a full statement of the crime of which he had been convicted (other than crimes committed before attaining 16 years of age and minor traffic violations for which a fine of \$25 or less was imposed), and information regarding any criminal charges punishable by confinement of 30 days or more which might be pending against him;

(4) to declare that the National Science Foundation may refuse or revoke any scholarship or fellowship award in the best interests of the United States.⁴⁴

In a letter dated August 22, 1961, to Representative Brooks, in response to a request for comments on H.R. 8556, Dr. Waterman said that the view of the Foundation was that "its authority is sufficiently flexible under the present provisions of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 to successfully administer its fellowships programs."⁴⁵ While officials of the Foundation felt that H.R. 8556 was not essential, they did not believe that it would interfere with the administration of its fellowship programs.

H.R. 8556 was taken up for consideration on the House floor on September 6 on the motion of Representative George P. Miller, Democrat of California, ranking majority member of the Science and Astronautics Committee acting in place of the ailing Overton Brooks.⁴⁶ Speaking in favor of its passage, members of the Committee declared

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 197.

⁴⁴ *Report No. 1029*. House. 87th Congress, 1st Session. August 24, 1961. p. 1.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴⁶ Mr. Brooks died in Washington of pneumonia on September 16, 1961.

the bill was necessary to avert any recurrences of cases similar to the Yellin one. Representative James G. Fulton, Republican of Pennsylvania, brought out through questioning of the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Representative Francis E. Walter, Democrat of Pennsylvania, that there were still pending three additional cases of persons belonging to subversive organizations who had received fellowships from the National Science Foundation.⁴⁷

Proposal Made That NSF Amendments Apply to NDEA

Representative James C. Corman, Democrat of California, who in Committee hearings had proposed that any bill passed by the Science and Astronautics Committee should contain provisions with respect to the loyalty oath and disclaimer affidavit similar to those recommended by the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, declared that the disclaimer affidavit was an undue imposition on the academic world without being an effective tool in preventing Communists from receiving educational benefits. In addition to urging passage of H.R. 8556, Mr. Corman said that "it would be my hope that the House and Senate Education Committees give careful consideration to amending the National Defense Education Act at their earliest opportunity so that those Federal fellowships, scholarships and other academic subsidies may be administered under an identical provision."⁴⁸

Mr. Corman pointed out to his colleagues that under H.R. 8556, for the loyal student, nothing other than a normal, affirmative declaration of loyalty to his country was required. For the Communist, the mere act of application would constitute a crime and would enable the prosecutor to proceed without the additional burden of making a case of perjury.

H.R. 8556 was passed by the House on a voice vote on September 6, 1961, and sent over to the Senate where it was referred on September 7, 1961, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which had legislative oversight of the activities of the National Science Foundation. The committee took no action on it for a whole year. Then it reported out the bill, with amendments, on September 21, 1962. This was possible without a new bill since the same Congress was in session. The amendments proposed extending H.R. 8556 to the appropriate provisions of the National Defense Education Act. The committee felt that improvements in section 16(d) of the National Science Foundation Act, as proposed in the House bill, should also be made in section 1001(f) of NDEA in order to preserve the conformity between these two provisions which was achieved when NDEA was enacted. It was pointed out that substantially similar improvements were included in S.

2345 which had been reported out of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee in 1961.

The committee report stated that "the so-called disclaimer affidavit is considered to be ineffective and substitution of a criminal penalty is considered to be a more desirable provision. Precedent for this substitution of criminal penalties for the affidavit is contained in provisions of the 1959 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act."⁴⁹ The report pointed out that skepticism as to the efficacy of the disclaimer affidavit procedure had been expressed by committees of both Houses of Congress. In the opinion of competent counsel, recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court reinforced this concern, and hence direct criminal penalties, as proposed by the bill, were considered more effective.

H.R. 8556, as amended, was taken up by the Senate on September 27, 1962. There was no discussion except on a couple of clarifying amendments clearing up clerical errors which had been discovered by Senator Goldwater. The bill was passed by the Senate by a voice vote. The ease with which this bill passed the Senate was in marked contrast to the heated debates over similar bills during each of the 2 preceding years.

Because H.R. 8556 had been amended by the Senate, it had to return to the House for concurrence. On October 2, 1962, H.R. 8556, as amended, was taken up from the Speaker's desk for consideration by the House, and Representative Olin E. Teague, Democrat of Texas, second ranking majority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, moved that the House concur with the Senate amendments. The motion passed without objection. Mr. Teague received permission to have inserted into the *Congressional Record* the exchange of letters between Chairman George P. Miller of the Science and Astronautics Committee and Chairman Adam C. Powell of the Education and Labor Committee.

In his letter to Mr. Powell on September 26, 1962, Mr. Miller said it was contemplated that his committee would request that H.R. 8556, if passed by the Senate, be taken up from the Speaker's desk and acted upon in the House. He pointed out that the amendments to NDEA proposed by the bill really fell under the jurisdiction of Mr. Powell's committee, and Mr. Miller wanted to know if Mr. Powell had any objections to the procedure suggested. Mr. Powell wrote back on September 27 that he was agreeable:

"I have reviewed my committee's report No. 674, issued July 6, 1961, to accompany H.R. 7904. This report, on pages 66 and 67, notes a proposed change which we considered advisable and as a substitute for the present provisions of section 1001(f). It is my belief that the amendment proposed in H.R. 8556 to this section is consistent with the recommendations made by my committee last year.

"In reviewing the minutes of our meeting on H.R. 7904, I note that our proposed amendment had full bipartisan

⁴⁷ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 107, Part 14. 87th Congress, 1st Session. September 6, 1961. p. 18225.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 18242.

⁴⁹ *Report No. 2117*. Senate. 87th Congress, 2d Session. September 21, 1962. p. 3.

support. Because of this finding and in view of the time pressure referred to above, I believe I can advise you that the amendment proposed to section 1001(f) of the NDEA in H.R. 8556 is acceptable to my committee." ⁵⁰

Amendment to NDEA Signed into Law

President Kennedy signed H.R. 8556 into law (Public Law 87-835) on October 16, 1962, thus bringing to an end the 4-year struggle to remove the disclaimer affidavit. Although some proponents for elimination of the affidavit would have preferred the outright elimination of section 1001(f) with no substitute, such as was provided in S. 819 in 1959, it was clear that no bill could have passed without the inclusion of a loyalty oath and provisions preventing educational assistance funds from going to Communists and other subversives.

Following is the new section 1001(f), as approved on October 16, 1962, and still law as of 1968, which is the final year of this report on title IV of NDEA:

(f) (1) No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under the authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic."

(2) No fellowship or stipend shall be awarded to any individual under the provisions of title IV or of part A of title VI of this Act unless such individual has provided the Commissioner (in the case of applications made on or after October 1, 1962) with a full statement regarding any crimes of which he has ever been convicted (other than crimes committed before attaining sixteen years of age and minor traffic violations for which a fine of \$25 or less was imposed) and regarding any criminal charges punishable by confinement of thirty days or more which may be pending against him at the time of his application for such fellowship or stipend.

(3) The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to the oath or affirmation required under paragraph (1) of this subsection and to the statement required under paragraph (2).

(4) (A) When any Communist organization, as defined in paragraph (5) of section 3 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, is registered or there is in effect a final order of the Subversive Activities Control Board requiring such organization to register, it shall be unlawful for any member of such organization with knowledge or notice that such organization is so registered or that such order has become final (i) to make application for any payment or loan which is to be made from funds part or all of which are appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under the authority of this Act, or (ii) to use or attempt to use any such payment or loan.

(B) Whoever violates subparagraph (A) of this paragraph shall be

fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(g) Nothing contained in this Act shall prohibit the Commissioner from refusing or revoking a fellowship award under title IV of this Act, in whole or in part, in the case of any applicant or recipient, if the Commissioner is of the opinion that such award is not in the best interests of the United States.

Some Discontent with Public Law 87-835 Arises

The signing of Public Law 87-835 by President John F. Kennedy was hailed as a great victory by opponents of the affidavit. However, there was no universal satisfaction over what replaced it. The principal objection to the new law was the requirement of the listing of crimes and the prohibition of membership in any organization ordered to register by the Subversive Activities Control Board. The Sage School of Philosophy at Cornell University considered the new requirement as objectionable on the grounds that (1) it was not clear what kind of crimes would be considered as making an applicant ineligible for a fellowship and (2) some individuals who had innocently belonged to some organizations like civil rights or "free speech" groups which could later be required to register with the Subversive Activities Control Board because Communists may have joined them, might be denied fellowships for that reason. It was felt that this amounted to a form of thought control since students would be in a sense surrendering their rights to freedom of association in order to keep themselves eligible for attractive fellowships. The Cornell philosophy department considered as particularly objectionable the listing of crimes with which one was charged but not convicted.

The Cornell philosophy department brought this matter to the attention of the university's graduate faculty at a special meeting on May 20, 1966. By a decisive majority the Cornell graduate faculty passed a resolution deploring the requirement of listing crimes and membership in organizations ordered to register with the Subversive Activities Control Board.

With no knowledge of the action taken by the Cornell philosophy department, the philosophy department at Harvard University also decided not to participate in the NDEA fellowship program.

The Cornell philosophy department circulated a letter to philosophy departments in other universities, telling the action they and the philosophy department at Harvard University had taken and soliciting others to do the same. Although concern in other philosophy departments was reported by Office of Education regional coordinators in their visits to institutions, the Cornell letter did not have much effect. No other philosophy department has offered to remove itself from the program for any reason whatsoever.

⁵⁰ *Congressional Record*. Vol. 108, Part 16. 87th Congress, 2d Session. October 2, 1962. p. 21729.

CHAPTER XV

statistical review and evaluation of the success of the NDEA title IV program

At the time it was passed and many times thereafter, Members of Congress, administration officials, and leading educators have hailed the National Defense Education Act of 1958 as a notable landmark of Federal legislation in education. In terms of significance of legislation up to the time of its enactment it has been ranked with the Northwest Ordinance Act of 1785 (which essentially founded the school system of a large number of States), the Morrill Act of 1862 (which established the land-grant college system), and the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 (which substantially aided the development of vocational education in the United States).

Certainly, title IV, National Defense Fellowships, ranks as one of the most successful titles of NDEA. As the name of the act implies, NDEA was created as a national de-

fense measure in response to the Soviet launching in October of 1957 of the first manmade satellite to orbit the earth. The graduate fellowship title was included in this act of 10 titles because of the strong conviction that there was impending a more serious shortage of college teachers than was generally realized at that time. Thus, although the fellowships were officially designated as "National Defense Fellowships," and were commonly referred to as graduate fellowships, they were actually fellowships for college teaching, and toward the end of the period of this report, as the national defense concept of NDEA diminished, they became more appropriately referred to, even on Capitol Hill, as "college teacher fellowships."

At no time did title IV come under attack as not being a necessary program. True, some Members of Congress

were opposed to the concept of Federal aid to education and therefore were against NDEA in principle. But the only real controversy that ever developed in Congress over title IV occurred in 1964 when some Members thought that the proposed expansion in the number of new fellowships was too large.

Title IV Program Highlights

The original authorization for the NDEA title IV program was modest, calling for 1,000 3-year fellowships for the first year and 1,500 new fellowships for each of the succeeding 3 years. An attempt in 1961 to expand the program for 1962-63 and succeeding years failed because of the church-State controversy, and title IV was authorized for 1,500 new fellowships again for 2 more years until June 30 of 1964.

In 1963 a major expansion of up to 10,000 new 3-year fellowships was proposed by the administration as part of a comprehensive, omnibus bill cited as the National Education Improvement Act of 1963. Because of the magnitude of the bill's provisions, and national priorities existing in 1963, only two of the proposed amendments to title IV were passed and in December of 1963 signed into a law which extended NDEA for one additional year, to June 30, 1965. The amendments (1) granted authority to re-award the unused portions of vacated fellowships and (2) provided for a flat \$2,500 cost-of-education payment per fellow, per year, to an institution. Up to that time, only a maximum of \$2,500 could be paid for costs proven to be attributable to each fellow.

In 1964, the 88th Congress took up where it had left off in 1963 and proceeded to pass legislation which produced a major expansion and change in the title IV program of NDEA. This legislation extended the authorization for title IV until June 30, 1968. It authorized 3,000 new 3-year fellowships in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, 6,000 in the following year, and 7,500 in each of the next 2 years. Authorized for the first time were additional payments to fellows for summer study.

Also of major significance in the 1964 amendments was elimination of the requirement that all the new fellowships go to new or expanded institutional programs. In the early years of the program emphasis was on new programs and, as time went on, the emphasis shifted to expanded programs. As a result of the 1964 amendments, only a fraction of the fellowships were required to go to new or expanded programs; the Commissioner of Education was authorized to award the remainder of the fellowships as he saw fit. This meant that the Commissioner could for the first time allocate the fellowships more in accordance with the existing strength and capacity of graduate institutions.

Until 1964 a specified number of fellowships was allocated to each approved fellowship program. This procedure was changed in late 1964 when an administrative decision was made to allocate a bloc of fellowships annually to an institution, then allow the institution to distribute the

fellowships among its approved programs as it wished. This was a major policy change.

Legislation introduced in 1967 that would have extended the title IV program beyond June 30, 1968, was not passed that year because of the uncertainty of the military draft situation and the pressure of other critical legislation. However, the 90th Congress picked up where it had left off in 1967 and in 1968 passed the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968, which extended the title IV program for another 5 years, until June 30, 1973, with an authorization of 7,500 new 3-year fellowships for each of these years. It also permitted in special circumstances, the award of fourth-year fellowships to fellows who needed one additional year to complete their doctoral studies. In line with the professed purpose of increasing the number of college teachers, the amendments required that institutions make reasonable continuing efforts to encourage recipients of title IV fellowships to teach or continue to teach in institutions of higher education.

The 1968 amendments also permitted the Office of Education, if it chose to do so, to raise the institutional cost-of-education payment up to \$3,500 per fellow, per year, and also to pay fellows stipends and dependency allowances in amounts consistent with those of other Federal fellowship programs.¹ The amendments also contained provisions for denial of fellowship benefits to disrupting students; for removal of the ban against fellows receiving Veterans Administration educational benefits at the same time as they were receiving title IV benefits; and for the establishment of an Advisory Council on Graduate Education to advise the Commissioner of Education on all facets of graduate education. The latter provision terminated the Title IV Advisory Committee that had functioned up to that time.

Appropriations, Obligations, and Expenditures

Unlike most Federal programs, there never has been any specific dollar amount authorization for title IV. Rather, it is the number of fellowships which has had an annual authorized ceiling. This maximum number of fellowships, when considered in conjunction with stipends for first, second, and third years of fellowship tenure and with allowances for dependents, has served as the basis for annual appropriations for the title IV program.

Each year the Office of Education makes a budget request, through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget acts upon this request, either approving it or modifying it, and sends it to Congress. The Congress holds hearings on the appropriation request, approves or modifies it, and eventually passes an appropriation bill. An appropriation is, in reality, obligational authority—that is, a Federal agency or department can obligate funds for its stated purposes up to the amount specified in the appropriation.

¹ It is a fact of interest here that the Commissioner of Education chose not to implement this newly granted authority because of the diminishing amount of funds appropriated for the title IV program.

Title IV of NDEA has never appeared as a "line item" in any appropriation law. Rather, during the first eight years of the program it was included in the category of Defense Educational Activities, during the ninth year in the category of Higher Education Activities, and during the tenth year in the category of Education Professions Activities.

As mentioned in chapter III of this report, it was decided from the beginning that for practical reasons funds appropriated in one fiscal year would be obligated that fiscal year and expended the following fiscal year. It would be impossible to do otherwise as Congress often does not pass appropriations bills until August, September, or October. Furthermore, leadtime is needed to allocate the fellowships to institutions, announce the allocations, publicize the availability of fellowships, and sign up the fellows for the following year. This is the "forward financing" feature of the title IV program.

Table 1. Appropriations, obligations, and expenditures for the NDEA title IV program: Annually, appropriations and obligations from fiscal year 1959 through fiscal year 1968; and expenditures from fellowship year 1959-60 through fellowship year 1968-69

Appropriation and obligation (in thousands of dollars)		Corresponding expenditure (in thousands of dollars)	
Fiscal year	Appropriation ¹ Obligation ¹	Fellowship year ²	Expenditure ³
1959.....	5,300.0 5,294.0	1959-60	\$ 4,620.4
1960.....	12,800.0 12,569.5	1960-61	11,451.3
1961.....	20,750.0 19,868.0	1961-62	17,312.8
1962.....	22,262.0 21,371.8	1962-63	19,603.5
1963.....	21,200.0 20,701.8	1963-64	19,680.4
1964.....	21,200.0 21,197.0	1964-65	20,695.3
1965.....	32,740.0 31,359.0	1965-66	29,779.8
1966.....	58,108.0 55,824.0	1966-67	53,640.2
1967.....	81,957.0 80,842.0	1967-68	n.y.a.
1968.....	86,600.0 86,275.0	1968-69	n.y.a.
Total....	\$362,917.0 \$355,302.1	Total	n.y.a.*

*Not yet available.

¹ Under the "forward financing" feature of the NDEA title IV program, funds are appropriated and obligated in one fiscal year for expenditure in the following year.

² A fellowship year extends from September 1 of one calendar year to August 31 of the next year.

³ From 1959-60 through 1963-64, there were no payments for summer study and a fellowship year was identical to an academic year. Stipend and dependency payments for summer study first came into existence in the summer of 1965, and these payments came from fiscal year 1966 funds. Fiscal year 1966 funds also paid for study during the summer of 1966. Thereafter, funds appropriated and obligated in one fiscal year were always expended in the following fellowship year (academic year and the following summer).

Table 1 shows, for each year, the annual appropriation and obligation for the title IV program. The corresponding expenditures for years through 1966-67 are shown.

The final figures for expenditures for 1967-68, and 1968-69 were not available at the time the writing of this report was completed.

The magnitude and significance of the NDEA title IV program is evident when one notes that more than one-third of a billion dollars was expended on the program during the first 10 years. Due to the rapid expansion of the program in the later years, almost half of this amount was expended in the last 2 years of the period—1967-68 and 1968-69.

It should be remembered, of course, that expenditures for the title IV program consist of payments to fellows and to institutions. Although the amounts paid to each of these two categories varied slightly over the 10 years because of changing regulations, a reasonable estimate is that about 45 percent of the expenditures went for payments to institutions and about 55 percent directly to fellows in the form of stipends and dependency allowances. Although sizable parts of the institutional payments were used to pay the tuition charges and fees that were waived for NDEA fellows, the institutional payments certainly have made a valuable and substantial contribution to the general support of graduate education at the participating institutions.

Participation by Institutions

Table 2 shows that the number of participating (active) institutions has grown steadily—from 123 in 1959-60 to 199 in 1968-69.

In view of the fact that NDEA was signed into law on September 2, 1958, thus leaving little time to announce the title IV program and get it under way, it is surpris-

Table 2. Number of institutions applying for program approval, number receiving approval of one or more programs, and number of active institutions: Annually, 1959-60—1968-69

For fellowship year	Number of institutions applying for approval of one or more programs	Number of institutions receiving approval of one or more program applications	Number of active institutions ¹
1959-60.....	172	123	123
1960-61.....	157	137	139
1961-62.....	161	145	149
1962-63.....	170	153	161
1963-64.....	172	155	166
1964-65.....	180	156	168
1965-66.....	173	152	169
1966-67.....	187	170	178
1967-68.....	201	193	195
1968-69.....	206	199	199

¹ The number of active institutions in any year is the sum of the number of those institutions which have received approval of one or more of their program applications for that year and the number of institutions with no new approvals that year but which have one or more fellows in second or third year of active tenure in some previously approved program.

ing that as many as 172 institutions requested approval of one or more programs for 1959-60. This number is further notable because the program director in 1958-69, Dean J.P. Elder, discouraged several of the prestigious institutions from submitting applications.

Because of the small number (1,000) of fellowships available for award in the initial year of the program, only 123 of the 172 applying institutions were successful in gaining approval of one or more programs. For the next year, an institution that had already received support the first year could apply for support of programs not supported the preceding year and could apply for expanded support (additional fellowships) for a program previously approved. An institution with no approved program for 1959-60 could, of course, apply for approval of one or more programs for 1960-61, regardless of whether it had applied for approval of programs for 1959-60. Thus, 137 institutions of 157 applicants received approval of programs for 1960-61. The fact that there were 139 participating, or active, institutions in 1960-61 means, of course, that two institutions that had one or more approved programs in 1959-60 did not have any new approvals for 1960-61 (did not apply or were turned down). The two institutions are nevertheless called active institutions because they still had active fellows on their second year of tenure in a previously approved program.

It is seen from table 2 that the number of active institutions increased rapidly to 161 in 1962-63 and then increased slowly to 169 in 1965-66. Then, after policy permitted allocating fellowships "en bloc" to institutions rather than to specific programs, and the number of authorized fellowships was greatly enlarged, another spurt took place, with the number of participating institutions reaching a high of 199 in 1968-69.

The great interest that graduate schools have shown in the title IV program is evidenced by the large number of applying institutions each year. Eighty to 90 percent of eligible doctorate-granting institutions have consistently applied for participation in the program.

Program Applications and Approvals

It has always been a requirement that an institution of higher education have an approved program before it was eligible to receive NDEA title IV fellowships. As explained earlier, the procedure followed during the first 6 years of the title IV program was to allocate a specific number of fellowships to each approved program. A program receiving approval one year was permitted to apply for additional support during following years, each succeeding application being treated as a new one. It was not the intent at that time, however, to provide Federal support in perpetuity to an approved program. Rather, it was expected that after several years of support such a program would be able to operate without Federal aid.

Following the substantial expansion in the number of fellowships authorized by the 1964 amendments, a bloc of fellowships was allocated to an institution and the institution allowed to assign the fellowships among approved departments in any manner it chose, except that starting in 1966-67, the Office of Education requested assignment, insofar as possible, of approximately two-thirds of its allocation to nonscience programs.

Number of Applications and Approvals

Table 3 shows for all programs, the total number of applications received and the number and percent approved for each of the 10 years of this report, as well as

Table 3. Number of NDEA title IV program applications and number and percent of program approvals: Annually, by nonscience versus science areas, 1959-60-1968-69

For year	All programs			Nonscience programs			Science programs		
	Number of applications	Number approved	Percent approved ¹	Number of applications	Number approved	Percent approved ¹	Number of applications	Number approved	Percent approved ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1959-60.....	1,040	272	26	447	134	30	593	138	23
1960-61.....	918	404	44	450	213	47	468	191	41
1961-62.....	948	521	55	506	287	57	442	234	53
1962-63.....	1,120	565	50	570	288	51	550	277	50
1963-64.....	1,175	618	53	579	313	54	596	305	51
1964-65.....	1,243	690	56	602	359	60	641	331	52
1965-66.....	2,283	905	40	1,057	504	48	1,226	401	33
1966-67.....	2,916	2,059	71	1,343	883	66	1,573	1,176	75
1967-68.....	3,114	2,690	86	1,401	1,143	82	1,713	1,547	90
1968-69.....	3,337	2,993	90	1,502	1,290	86	1,835	1,703	93
Total, all years..	18,094	11,717	65	8,457	5,413	64	9,637	6,304	65

¹ Percent of approval is not a function of quality of applications alone. Factors such as geography, availability of similar programs in nearby institutions, and priority given in any one year to science or nonscience programs have also been at times significant considerations in the approval process over the 10-year period of this report.

a comparison between nonscience and science programs.

It will be noted that the number of program applications during the first 6 years varied only between 918 and 1,243. However, the approval rate increased, for the most part steadily, from a 26 percent approval rate for programs to commence in 1959-60 to 56 percent for programs to commence in 1964-65. The low approval rate of 26 percent for 1959-60 does not mean that the 272 programs that were approved for that year were the only good and approvable ones submitted that year. In that year, as well as succeeding years, lack of funds prevented the approval of many worthy applications. In addition to limitation of funds, factors such as geography, availability of similar programs at nearby institutions, and priority given in any one year to science or nonscience programs have played significant roles in the process of approval or disapproval of program applications.

The reason the approval rate increased over the first 6 years was that many applications after the first year were for additional support for previously approved programs. Such applications had a high approval rate.

In 1965-66, the number of program applications jumped to 2,283 and continued to rise steadily, reaching 3,337 in 1968-69. The approval rate dropped, however, from 56 percent for 1964-65 to 40 percent for 1965-66. The reason for this decrease was that there were two separate review competitions to consider program approvals for 1965-66. The first competition for 1,500 new fellowships was held in the summer of 1964 and was conducted on the same basis as previous competitions up to that date. As a result of the NDEA amendments enacted in 1964, a second competition was held in the winter of 1965 for the remainder of the 3,000 new fellowships which had been authorized for the fall of 1965.

This second competition was based on the new procedures of "en bloc" allocations of fellowships to institutions and the furtherance of the then existing concept of "centers of excellence." Under this concept a limited number of institutions were selected to receive extra allocations of fellowships to assist them in moving toward the highest levels of recognized academic excellence. This selectivity meant disapproval of worthy applications from many institutions, thus bringing the approval rate of applications down to 40 percent.

In the following years, the "centers of excellence" concept was essentially abandoned, and the approval rate rose steadily thereafter, reaching 90 percent of the program applications for 1968-69. A factor in this steady rise was that after initial approval of a program, usually all that was required in following years was a progress report, and the rate of approval of progress reports was very high.

Upon comparing nonscience programs with science programs, it is seen from table 3 that, except in 1961-62 and in 1962-63, there were more program applications from the science fields than from the nonscience fields. The approval rate of program applications in the nonscience fields, however, was higher than in the science fields during the first 7 years—1959-60 through 1965-66—but the reverse was true during the last 3 years—1966-67 through 1968-69.

Percentage Distribution of Approved Programs by Academic Area

Table 4 shows the percentage distribution of approved programs by academic area as well as by nonscience area versus science area. It will be noted that of all the programs approved in 1959-60, 51 percent were in the science area and 49 percent in the nonscience area. For the next 6

Table 4. Percent distribution of NDEA title IV program approvals: Annually, by academic area, 1959-60—1968-69

Year	Nonscience area				Science area			
	Total	Education	Humanities	Social sciences	Total	Biological sciences ¹	Engineering	Physical sciences ²
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
1959-60.....	49	6	22	22	51	18	9	23
1960-61.....	53	7	23	23	47	16	11	20
1961-62.....	55	8	21	26	45	17	9	19
1962-63.....	51	9	19	23	49	18	12	19
1963-64.....	51	9	17	24	49	18	12	20
1964-65.....	52	9	19	24	48	14	15	19
1965-66.....	56	7	22	27	44	15	10	19
1966-67.....	43	6	20	17	57	22	14	21
1967-68.....	43	7	20	16	57	23	15	19
1968-69.....	44	7	20	17	56	24	14	18

NOTE: Sum of components may not add to total, due to rounding.

¹ Includes psychology.

² Includes the mathematical sciences.

years, most of the approved programs were in the non-science area, reaching a high of 56 percent in 1965-66. In the year 1966-67 and following, a remarkable reverse of these percentages took place, with only 43 percent of all approved programs being in the nonscience area in 1966-67 and 1967-68 and 44 percent in 1968-69. This reversal was due to the fact that, as shown in table 3, the number of applications in the science fields and the approval rate of them from 1966-67 on, was much higher than in the nonscience fields.

As far as separate academic areas are concerned, during the first 7 years of the period covered by this report there was generally more approved programs in the social sciences area than in the humanities area. In the last 3 years, the reverse was true. Similarly, whereas the number of approved programs in the physical and mathematical sciences exceeded the number in the biological sciences and psychology during the first 7 years, the reverse was true for the last 3 years.

The percent of the approved programs in the area of education did not vary significantly during the full 10-year period. It ranged between 6 and 9 percent of all the approved programs for any one year. Engineering, on the other hand, with only 9 percent of the approved programs in 1959-60, tended to increase its percentage over the years, stabilizing at 14 or 15 percent during the last 3 years.

Number of New and Reawarded Fellowships

A total of 26,828 new fellowships were awarded during the first 10 years of the NDEA title IV program. Of these 26,828 fellowships, 26,251 were 3-year awards, 540 were 2-year awards, and 37 were 1-year awards. The 2-year and 1-year awards of new fellowships resulted from the restrictive wording of the law and administrative policy that up to 150, or 10 percent, of the new fellowships commencing in the 5 years 1960-61 through 1964-65 could be awarded to advanced graduate students as 2-year or 1-year awards.

After legislation authorizing the refilling of vacated fellowships was signed into law on December 18, 1963, there was no longer any reason for awarding fellowships as 2-year or 1-year awards, except for 1964-65 when hardly any funds were available for refills. From 1965-66 on, all new fellowships were granted for a 3-year period.

Table 5 shows for each of the 10 years of this report the number of new fellowships authorized, the number requested by institutions, the number awarded, the number of reawards of resigned fellowships, and the total number of fellows on tenure at the beginning of the fellowship year. It will be noted from this table that the number awarded each year was the same as the number authorized

Table 5. Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships authorized, requested, and awarded; number of reawards of resigned fellowships; and the total number of fellows on tenure: Annually, by fellowship year, 1959-60-1968-69

Initial year of tenure of fellowship	Number of new fellowships authorized by law	Number of new fellowships requested by institutions	Number of new fellowships awarded	Number of reawards of resigned fellowships	Total number of fellows on tenure at beginning of fellowship year ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1959-60.....	1,000	5,987	1,000	—	1,000
1960-61.....	1,500	5,370	1,500	—	2,404
1961-62.....	1,500	5,094	1,500	—	3,712
1962-63.....	1,500	5,621	1,500	—	4,041
1963-64.....	1,500	5,600	1,500	—	4,118
1964-65.....	1,500	6,197	1,500	29	⁴ 4,200
1965-66.....	3,000	11,415	3,000	407	⁵ 6,000
1966-67.....	6,000	14,340	6,000	564	⁵ 10,500
1967-68.....	7,500	15,585	6,000	1,247	⁵ 15,000
1968-69.....	7,500	12,650	3,328	² 3,833	⁵ 15,328
Total.....	32,500	87,859	26,828	¹ 6,080	—

¹ Until 1964-65 resigned fellowships could not be reawarded. From 1964-65 through 1967-68 vacated fellowships could be reawarded at the beginning of a fellowship year, which was considered as September 1. Starting in 1968-69, a vacated fellowship could be reawarded at the beginning of any academic term.

² Estimate.

³ The number of fellows on tenure in any one year is the number of new fellows that year plus the number of active fellows in their second or third year of tenure.

⁴ Estimate.

⁵ Because of late resignations and fellows going on or returning from interruptions of tenure, these figures are approximate.

except for the last 2 years, 1967-68 and 1968-69, when the budgetary pressures of the Vietnam war began to be felt. A large upswing in the program commenced in 1965-66 due to the amendments passed in 1964. In fact, 12,000 fellowships, not far from half of the 26,828 awarded during the 10 years, were granted in just 2 years, 1966-67 and 1967-68.

Although 26,828 new fellowships were actually awarded, many more fellowships than this were requested by the applicant institutions. The variance between requests and actual awards ranged between about six times as many requests as awards in 1959-60 down to about two and one-half times as many requests as awards in 1966-67 and 1967-68. The largest number of new fellowship requests was 15,585 in 1967-68.

Column (5) shows the number of fellows receiving title IV fellowship support at the beginning of each fellowship year. This number is the sum of the number of new fellows that year plus the number of active fellows in second or third year of tenure.

From the beginning year 1959-60 to the middle of 1963-64, there was no authority to refill vacated fellowships. Therefore, for these years, the number of fellows on tenure at the beginning of a fellowship year from 1960-61 through 1963-64 was less than the number would have been if no one had resigned. For example, the number of fellows actually on tenure in the beginning of fellowship year 1960-61 was 2,404, but the number would have been 2,500 if no one from the 1959-60 class of 1,000 had resigned or had gone on an interruption of tenure and none of the 1,500 persons who were to start new fellowships in the fall of 1960 had declined their awards. Although the December 1963 amendments to title IV did permit the reaward of vacated fellowships, a supplemental appropriation request for this purpose during the following year was not approved, and only 29 vacated fellowships were refilled in 1964-65 from unused funds from the regular appropriation. In 1965-66 and succeeding years, most of the fellowships which became vacant were refilled at the beginning of the next fellowship year. The ones which were not refilled at the beginning of the next fellowship year did not expire but could be re-awarded at the beginning of some later fellowship year, and starting in 1968-69 they could even be reawarded at the beginning of any school term other than the summer term.

Column 4 shows the number of reawards for each year from 1964-65 to 1968-69. Combining the 6,080 reawarded fellowships with the 26,828 new fellowships granted, there results a total of 32,908 persons who held an NDEA title IV fellowship during the 10-year period of this report. Actually, the number of persons is slightly less than 32,908 because there is a small but undetermined number of individuals who held more than one fellowship. However, in no case was any individual permitted more than 3 years of fellowship tenure during the first 10 years of NDEA.²

² The Higher Education Amendments Act of 1968 permitted for the first time the award of a fourth year of an NDEA title IV fellowship in special circumstances. At the time this report was being prepared, this provision had not yet been implemented.

Geographical Distribution of Fellowships

One of the earliest principal objectives of NDEA title IV was the expansion and improvement of college teacher training facilities throughout the United States. The intent of Congress was clearly expressed in section 403 of title IV of the original act:

"The Commissioner shall approve a graduate program of an institution of higher education only upon application by the institution and only upon his finding:

1. that such program is a new program or an existing program which has been expanded, and
2. that such new program or expansion of an existing program will substantially further the objective of increasing the facilities available in the Nation for the graduate training of college or university level teachers and of promoting a wider geographical distribution of such facilities throughout the nation."

In 1964, when NDEA was substantially amended, Congress decreed that no fewer than 1,500 new fellowships awarded during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and not less than one-third of the fellowships awarded during each of the following 3 years of authorization would be subject to the rules enumerated above in the 1958 law. The Commissioner of Education was empowered to award the remaining new fellowships on such bases as he might determine, but he was directed to give consideration to equitable geographical distribution in determining the number of fellowships to be allocated to any one institution of higher education.

Regional Distribution

Table 6 gives, by the regional breakdown followed by the Office of Business Economics, U.S. Department of Commerce, the comparison of the geographical distribution of new title IV fellowship awards with earned doctorate production at three different periods of this 10-year report. Selected were a 2-year period (1959-61) at the beginning, a 2-year period (1963-65) near the middle, and a 2-year period (1966-68) near the end of the 10-year span. Two-year periods were chosen in order to minimize fluctuations that might occasionally occur in any 1 year.

In the period 1959-61 will be noted a generally great disparity between the percentage of fellowship awards and doctorate production. This disparity is a consequence of the emphasis in the first years of the title IV program on new doctoral programs. Thus, as extreme cases, we have the Southeast region receiving during these 2 years 24.5 percent of the new fellowships but producing only 8.4 percent of the doctorates, while, on the other hand, the Great Lakes region received only 13.3 percent of the new fellowships while producing 26.1 percent of the doctorates.

In the period 1963-65 the regional disparity between percentage distribution of fellowship awards and percentage distribution of doctorate production decreased considerably compared with the 1959-61 period. Although the

Table 6. Comparison of geographical distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowship awards with earned doctorate production: By Office of Business Economics (U. S. Department of Commerce) regions, periods 1959-61, 1963-65, and 1966-68

Region	Combined years 1959-60 and 1960-61		Combined years 1963-64 and 1964-65		Combined years 1966-67 and 1967-68	
	Fellowships	Doctorates	Fellowships	Doctorates	Fellowships	Doctorates
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	2,500	20,402	3,000	30,980	12,000	43,696
			<i>Number</i>			
			<i>Percent distribution</i>			
	100	100	100	100	100	100
New England	6.8	11.1	9.3	10.0	9.7	8.6
Midwest	15.4	26.5	19.4	23.5	22.0	22.5
Southeast	24.5	8.4	19.2	9.9	16.0	11.7
Great Lakes	13.3	26.1	17.2	24.6	17.9	22.9
Plains	10.8	8.8	10.5	8.8	9.4	8.8
Southwest	9.1	4.4	7.3	6.1	6.9	6.9
Rocky Mountains	6.8	2.5	4.6	3.2	4.3	3.8
Far West	13.4	12.3	12.5	13.9	13.7	14.6

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100.0, due to rounding.

New England: (Conn., Me., Mass., N. H., R. I., Vt.)

Midwest: (Del., D. C., Md., N. J., N. Y., Pa.)

Southeast: (Ala., Ark., Fla., Ga., Ky., La., Miss., N. C., S. C., Tenn., Va., W. Va.)

Great Lakes: (Ill., Ind., Mich., Ohio, Wisc.)

Plains: (Iowa, Kans. Minn., Mo. Neb., N. D. S. D.)

Southwest: (Ariz., N. M., Okla., Texas)

Rocky Mountains: (Colo., Ida., Mont., Utah, Wyo.)

Far West: (Alas., Cal., Hawaii, Nev., Ore., Wash.)

title IV program was operating in 1963-65 under the same law as in 1959-61 insofar as geographical consideration of fellowships was concerned, there was a shift on the part of applying institutions from emphasis on "newness" in the first years of the program to "expansion" 5 or so years later. This was to be expected since the demand for support of new graduate programs was greatest in the early years of the program, and the need for expansion of existing programs became more apparent as time went on. This meant that already-established graduate programs began to gain greater support, and fellowship support in general began to reflect existing patterns of graduate education throughout the country.

As a result of the policy shift in 1965 to "en bloc" allocation of fellowships, apportionment of fellowships to participating institutions was based for the most part of the "graduate strength" of each institution. This, of course, meant that after 1965, the distribution of fellowships quite well reflected the doctorate production patterns across the Nation. Thus, table 6 shows that for the period 1966-68 the regional percentage distribution of fellowships generally corresponded with the regional percentage distribution of earned doctorates. The only significant exceptions to this close correlation during this period were the Southeast re-

gion, with 16.0 percent of the fellowships and 11.7 percent of the doctorates, and the Great Lakes region, with 17.9 percent of fellowships and 22.9 percent of the doctorates.

Distribution by State and Institution

Appendix A gives, by State and institution, the number of new fellowships awarded during each of the 10 years of this report. Also given are the total number of fellowship awards and the percentage distribution of them in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. These data are also given for each institution.

The State of New York, with 24 participating institutions, received the largest percent, 9.60, of the fellowships, followed by: California, with 17 institutions and 8.20 percent of the awards; Illinois, with eight institutions and 5.35 percent; Massachusetts, with 11 institutions and 4.92 percent; and Pennsylvania, with 13 institutions, and 4.80 percent. All other States each received less than 4 percent of the awards.

Among the institutions, the University of Oregon received the most new fellowships, 433, followed by: Indiana University, 430; University of Chicago, 418; University of Wisconsin at Madison, 409; University of Minnesota, 408;

and Stanford University, 400. No other institution had as many as 400 new fellowships during the 10-year period of this report. However, it should be remarked here that the separate campuses of such complex institutions as the University of California, the University of Wisconsin, and the University of Missouri were treated as separate institutions. Twelve States and Puerto Rico had only one institution receiving fellowships. Most of these States had rather small populations, with the State of Minnesota being a notable exception.

Distribution of Fellowships by Academic and Subacademic Areas

When analyses were first made of the academic distribution of title IV fellowship awards, it was decided to classify the awards into six major academic areas as follows: the nonscience group, consisting of education, humanities, and social sciences; and the science group, consisting of biological sciences, physical sciences, and engineering. Grouped under the academic area rubrics were the various subacademic areas or disciplines.

For the most part, the various subacademic areas fell naturally into one of the six academic areas. Although they are not physical sciences and have a separate listing in Office of Education reports on earned degrees, the mathematical sciences were arbitrarily included in the physical sciences academic area because they were regarded as traditionally more closely associated with the physical sciences area than with any other. Psychology, likewise having a separate listing in Office of Education reports on earned

degrees, was arbitrarily placed with the biological sciences academic area because it was felt that this was the area with which it was most closely identified.³ However, two smaller, special areas of psychology—educational psychology and social psychology—were included in the education and social sciences areas, respectively.

Distribution of Fellowships by Academic Area

Table 7 shows for each year of the 10-year period of this report, as well as for the total of the 10 years, the percentage distribution of new fellowship awards by academic area as well as by nonscience versus science areas. It will be noted that the percent of awards in the nonscience areas was not far from 60 percent except in 3 of the years. The percent was 55.4 in 1959-60 when the influence of the "national defense" concept of the then recently passed NDEA was especially strong and was 55.7 percent in 1962-63 and 55.0 percent in 1963-64 after the Congress had criticized the Office of Education in 1961 for awarding fellowships in such "nondefense fields" as folklore, speech, music, and drama and theater. The combined areas of the humanities and social sciences received over half of the 26,828 fellowships awarded.

From 1966-67 on, because of the greater availability of

³ Although the expression "biological sciences and psychology" is used in this report to emphasize that psychology is part of this grouping, the use at times of the expression "biological sciences" is nevertheless meant to include psychology. Similarly, the use of "physical sciences" alone is meant to include the mathematical sciences.

Table 7. Percent distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowship awards: Annually, by year of initial tenure and academic area, 1959-60—1968-69

Academic area	Percent by year of initial tenure										Percent distribution of total awards
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Nonscience area											
Education	5.0	7.3	8.1	9.5	10.3	9.0	7.0	7.4	7.2	7.3	7.6
Humanities	26.2	27.7	25.6	21.1	21.5	23.9	24.7	26.3	27.2	28.5	26.0
Social sciences	24.2	28.2	27.7	25.1	23.2	25.7	28.4	23.9	23.8	25.0	25.1
Total	55.4	63.2	61.4	55.7	55.0	58.6	60.1	57.6	58.2	60.8	58.7
Science area											
Biological sciences & psychology	16.3	10.2	12.1	15.7	17.0	13.5	12.5	15.4	15.8	16.5	14.9
Engineering	8.0	9.4	9.6	11.1	10.8	10.9	9.2	9.7	9.4	8.7	9.6
Physical and mathematical sciences	20.3	17.1	16.8	17.6	17.2	17.1	18.2	17.2	16.6	14.1	16.9
Total	44.6	36.7	38.5	44.4	45.0	41.5	39.9	42.3	41.8	39.2	41.3

NOTE: Detail may not add to 100, due to rounding.

fellowships to the science areas, the Office of Education requested participating institutions to award, insofar as practicable, two-thirds of their allocated fellowships to the nonscience areas. In spite of this request, the percentage of fellowships awarded to the nonscience areas in 1966-67, in 1967-68, and in 1968-69 did not deviate significantly from the percentages of the earlier years.

Although most institutions complied with the Office of Education recommendation, there were a sizable number of institutions, such as engineering schools and medical schools, with no approved nonscience programs to which they could assign fellowships. Consequently, it was not possible to achieve on a national basis, an allocation of two-thirds of the fellowships to nonscience area. The Office of Education request did, nevertheless, prove to be quite effective because it kept the proportion of fellowships in the nonscience areas stable at a time when the number of programs in the science areas increased disproportionately. In 1968-69, for example, 61 percent of the fellowships went to the nonscience areas although only 44 percent of the approved programs were in these areas.

Distribution of Fellowships by Subacademic Area

Appendix B gives for each year the number of new fellowships awarded to each subacademic area, or discipline, as well as the total number for the 10 years, and the percentage that the total number of fellowships awarded to each subacademic area constituted of the total number (26,828) of fellowships awarded. The field of English received the most awards—1,943, representing 7.2 percent of all the fellowships awarded. History was second with 1,519 fellowships or 5.7 percent of the awards, followed by chemistry with 1,322 fellowships or 4.9 percent of the awards. Following is a tabulation in rank order of all disciplines receiving 1,000 or more fellowships:

Discipline	Total number and percent of new fellowships awarded 1959-60 through 1968-69	
	Number	Percent
English	1,943	7.2
History	1,519	5.7
Chemistry	1,322	4.9
Mathematical sciences	1,274	4.7
Physics	1,194	4.5
Political science and government	1,171	4.4
Romance languages	1,163	4.3
Economics	1,100	4.1
Psychology	1,086	4.0
Philosophy	1,024	3.8

Comparison of Distribution of Fellowships by Academic Field with Certain Other Indices

Comparison by Broad Academic Area

Table 8 gives by academic areas a comparison of the percentage distribution of the total number of new fellowship

Table 8. Comparison of percentage distribution of 26,828 new NDEA title IV fellowships with (1) the spring 1963 percentage distribution of 138,149 teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges and the percentage of these faculty possessing the doctorate, and (2) the percentage distribution of the combined total of doctorates awarded in 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68: By academic areas, aggregate United States

Academic Area	Percent distribution of total (26,828) new fellowships, 1959-60—1968-69	Percent distribution of total (138,149) teaching faculty, spring 1963	Percent of teachers in column (2) who possess the doctorate	Percent distribution of total (45,742) doctorates awarded, 1959-60, 1962-63, 1967-68
Total	(1) 100.0	(2) 100.0	(3) 100.0	(4) 100.0
Education	7.8	13.7	42.8	17.3
Humanities	25.9	26.8	42.4	12.8
Social sciences	25.2	18.4	55.7	14.9
Nonscience area, total	58.8	58.9	46.7	45.0
Biological sciences and psychology	14.9	18.2	60.3	22.4
Engineering	9.7	6.9	39.0	11.1
Physical and mathematical sciences	17.0	14.1	64.4	21.0
Science area, total	41.2	39.1	58.1	54.5
Other ¹	0.0	1.9	— ²	0.5

¹ Includes such fields as architecture and military science not classifiable under any of the preceding academic areas.

² Not readily ascertainable. The percentage of such persons possessing the doctorate is relative small, however.

Source of data in column (2) is: *Teaching Faculty in Universities and 4-Year Colleges, Spring 1963* (OE-53022-63), U.S. Office of Education.

Source of data in column (4) is U.S. Office of Education earned degree reports.

NOTE: For data on subacademic areas see Appendix C.

awards over the 10 years of this report with (1) the spring 1963 percentage distribution of 138,149 teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges and the percentage of these faculty possessing the doctorate,⁴ and (2) the percentage distribution of the combined total of doctorates awarded in 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68.

The percentage of new fellowships going to nonscience or science areas closely approximates the percentages of teachers in these broad areas. However, it will be noted that, although 58.9 percent of the teachers were in nonscience fields, only 46.7 percent of them possessed the doctorate; on the other hand, whereas 39.1 of the teaching faculty were in

⁴ Junior colleges were not included in the U.S. Office of Education 1963 study of college teaching faculty.

the science area, 58.1 percent of them held the doctorate.

Among the nonscience academic areas, the doctorate was more common in the social sciences (55.7 of the teaching faculty) than in education (42.8 percent) or the humanities (42.4 percent). The figure for education is low because a doctorate is not commonly a requirement for physical education teachers or for faculty teaching or supervising in campus laboratory schools. The figure is low in the humanities because the doctorate is usually not required for teachers of freshman English courses or for art and music teachers. The doctorate is quite common among teachers in the combined physical and mathematical sciences area, with almost two-thirds (64.4 percent) having the doctorate. Only 39.0 percent of the college teachers in engineering held the doctorate in 1963, but with the increasing rate of doctorate production in engineering in recent years, it is believed that this percentage is rising significantly.

From the point of view of new fellowship awards, the social sciences area did very well, receiving 25.2 percent of the fellowships while having only 18.4 percent of the teaching faculty and producing only 14.9 percent of the earned doctorates. On the other hand, the academic area of education received only 7.8 percent of the new fellowships, although it had 13.7 percent of the teaching faculty and 17.3 percent of the earned doctorate production.

Comparison by Subacademic Area

Whereas table 8 gives data by academic area, appendix C is more detailed in that it gives data by subacademic area. Following are some observations on the most interesting data:

HUMANITIES

English and comparative literature—8.7 percent of the new fellowships, 8.1 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 47.2 percent hold the doctorate, and 4.1 percent of the earned doctorate production.

Modern languages—7.8 percent of the fellowships, 4.7 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 54.0 hold the doctorate, and only 1.6 percent of the doctorate production.

Philosophy—3.8 percent of the fellowships, 1.6 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 68.7 percent have the doctorate, and only 1.2 percent of the doctorate production.

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Economics—4.1 percent of the fellowships, 2.3 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 66.9 percent possess the doctorate, and 2.5 percent of the doctorate production.

History—5.7 percent of the fellowships, 4.2 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 66.6 percent have a doctor's degree, and 2.5 percent of the doctorate production.

Political science—4.4 percent of the fellowships, 2.1 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 71.9 percent have a doctorate, and 1.9 of the doctorate production.

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AND PSYCHOLOGY

Psychology—4.0 percent of the fellowships, 2.8 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 81.8 percent hold the doctor's degree, and 6.1 percent of the doctorate production.

PHYSICAL AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

Chemistry—4.9 percent of the fellowships, 3.8 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 79.8 percent have the doctorate, and 8.7 of the doctorate production.

Mathematical sciences—4.8 percent of the fellowships, 5.5 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 47.9 percent have doctor's degrees, and 3.8 percent of the doctorate production.

Physics—4.5 percent of the fellowships, 3.1 percent of the teaching faculty, of whom 69.0 have the doctorate, and 5.5 percent of the total doctorate production.

Personal Characteristics of Title IV Fellows

Data on the personal characteristics of all of the 26,828 fellows who were awarded fellowships during 1958-68 have not been tabulated. However, a contract study of the first 4 years of the NDEA title IV program by the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., (BSSR) has produced data on the personal characteristics of the first 5,500 awardees of title IV fellowships.⁵ In the case of fellowships by sex of student, the data obtained by BSSR from the Office of Education files for the first 4 years have been extended to the full 10 years by the Office of Education staff.

Fellowships by Sex of Student

Table 9 shows the percentage distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowships by sex of student. It will be noted that the percentage of these fellowships going to women during each of the first 6 years of the title IV program was 14 percent except in 1959-60, when it was 13 percent and in 1961-62 when it was 12 percent. During the last 4 years the percentage rose sharply, reaching 28 percent by 1968-69.

There appear to be two reasons for the rapid rise in the percentage of title IV fellowships going to women. First, beginning in 1966-67, the Office of Education requested participating institutions to award, insofar as feasible, two-thirds of the new fellowships to students in the nonscience areas because of the limited fellowship support available to these areas compared with that available to the science areas. It is a well-known fact, of course, that women tend to major more in the nonscience areas than in the science areas. The BSSR Phase I study found that women constituted 24 percent of all the fellows studying in the humanities; 19 percent of those in education; 13 percent of those in the social sciences; 15 percent of those in the biological sciences; and 4 percent of those in the physical

⁵ Laure M. Sharp, Study Director. *Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program, Phase I* (Contract OEC-1-7-071052-2808). Washington: Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc. March 1968. 87 pp.

Table 9. Percentage distribution of new NDEA title IV fellowships by sex of student: Annually, 1959-60-1968-69

Year of initial tenure of fellowship	Number of new fellowships awarded	Percent of fellowships ¹	
		Men	Women
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1959-60.....	1,000	87	13
1960-61.....	1,500	86	14
1961-62.....	1,500	88	12
1962-63.....	1,500	86	14
1963-64.....	1,500	86	14
1964-65.....	1,500	86	14
1965-66.....	3,000	81	19
1966-67.....	6,000	80	20
1967-68.....	6,000	77	23
1968-69.....	3,328	72	28

¹ The percents for 1965-66, 1966-67, and 1967-68 are based upon 25 percent random samples of the fellows for these years. All other percents are universe counts.

sciences and engineering. It was reasonable to expect the percentage of new fellowships awarded to women to increase as a result of the Office of Education emphasis on the nonscience areas from 1966-67 on.

A second factor in the increase of title IV fellowships to women in recent years is the increasing percentage that women constitute of the graduate student population on American campuses. Graduate enrollment data on the total number of men and women, full-time and part-time, in graduate education in the United States, are not available for all the years covered by this report, but the data available for certain of these years serve as indicators of the trend.

Office of Education data on the percentage of women in graduate education, both full-time and part-time, show an increase from 29 percent in the fall of 1961 to 30 percent in the fall of 1963, to 31 percent in the fall of 1966, and to 32 percent in the fall of 1967. But these data do not give the full explanation, because fellows come mainly from the full-time graduate student population.

Breakdown of data by full-time and part-time men and women in graduate education is, at the time of this report, available only for the fall of 1966 and the fall of 1967. In the fall of 1966, there were enrolled in all levels of graduate education 195,818 men full-time and 189,852 men part-time, compared with 62,347 full-time women and 107,048 part-time women.⁶ In the fall of 1967, there were similarly 226,583 full-time men and 217,789 part-time men, compared with 74,557 full-time women and 130,768 part-

⁶ The largest number of enrollees is, of course, in the first year of graduate study, and especially in the case of women the number is relatively high because of the large number of women teachers enrolled in a postbaccalaureate course outside of their regular working hours.

time women.⁷ The percent increase of full-time women in all levels of graduate education in the fall of 1967 over the fall of 1966 was 20 percent, compared with a corresponding percent increase of only 16 percent for men.

When only first-year full-time enrollment is considered, the percentage increase for women is even greater. The number of full-time first-year men increased from 107,548 in the fall of 1966 to 116,920 in the fall of 1967—a 9 percent increase—while the similar number of women increased from 41,215 to 48,862—a 19 percent increase. These latter percents are especially significant in the explanation of the striking rise of title IV fellowships to women in recent years, because most new fellowships go to beginning students or students with little previous graduate work.

The impact that the escalation of the war in Vietnam had on the graduate school enrollment of men in the fall of 1966 and the fall of 1967 is purely speculative. Some graduate student military reservists were called to active duty. But draft deferment for graduate study, until the policy changed in February of 1968, undoubtedly served to induce some young men to enter or continue in graduate study who would not otherwise have done so.

Other Characteristics of the First 5,500 Title IV Fellows

Median Age. The Bureau of Social Science Research Phase I study revealed that the median age of the 5,500 fellows who were awarded title IV fellowships in the first 4 years of the NDEA title IV program (1959-60 through 1962-63) was 23.5 years. Male fellows were slightly older than female fellows, but the age difference was small. A little over one third of the NDEA fellows were 25 years of age or more at the time of their award. The proportion over age 30, though small, increased from 8 percent to 12 percent over the 4-year period.

Marital Status. Well over half of the title IV fellows (58 percent) were married at the time they received their fellowships. Male awardees were almost twice as likely to be married as female awardees. The BSSR study found that the proportion of married students among title IV fellows was approximately the same as the proportion among a comparable group of doctoral candidates drawn from a National Opinion Research Center (NORC) study of 1961⁸ and significantly higher than among other fellowship holders. The BSSR report to the Office of Education stated that "this finding tended to indicate that NDEA dependents' allowance effectively offsets the increased financial burdens on married students, permitting equitable distribution of NDEA fellowships regardless of marital status, while other fellowships presumably prove insufficient for married students."⁹

⁷ For data on full-time and part-time men and women in graduate education, see: Marjorie O. Chandler, *Students Enrolled for Advanced Degrees, Fall 1966* (OE-54019-66) and *Fall 1967* (OE-54019, Part B). Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.

⁸ James A. Davis, *Great Aspirations*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1964.

⁹ *Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowships Program: Phase I*, op. cit., p. 15.

Social Background. The BSSR study compared the socio-economic background of the 1,670 doctoral recipients out of the first 5,500 title IV fellows who had earned the doctorate by June 30, 1966, with a matched group of 3,265 comparable doctoral recipients obtained from the National Academy of Sciences Register of Earned Doctorates.¹⁰ It found that NDEA doctoral recipient fellows tended to come from slightly lower socio-economic backgrounds than non-NDEA fellows in the matched National Academy of Sciences (NAS) group, as measured by education of parents and private school attendance. Only 24 percent of the NDEA fellows, compared with 28 percent of the matched group, reported their father held a college degree. More of the title IV fellows came from public high schools; 86 percent of the title IV fellows, but only 80 percent of the matched group, had attended public schools. This finding seems to indicate that the NDEA title IV program has tended to equalize, slightly, the opportunities for graduate study.

Attrition of Title IV Fellows

The percentage of original NDEA title IV fellowship holders who failed to complete the full tenure of their fellowship varied considerably during the period covered by this report.¹¹ Table 10 shows the attrition rates for the

Table 10. Number and percent of original NDEA title IV fellows in each class who failed to complete the full tenure of their fellowships: Annually, by year of entering class, 1959-60-1968-69

Year of initial tenure of class	Number of new fellowships awarded	Number and percent of fellows who resigned before completing full tenure of fellowship	
		Number	Percent
1959-60.....	1,000	289	29
1960-61.....	1,500	386	26
1961-62.....	1,500	351	23
1962-63.....	1,500	357	24
1963-64.....	1,500	379	25
1964-65.....	1,500	394	26
1965-66.....	3,000	967	32
1966-67.....	6,000	2,130	36
1967-68.....	6,000	2,160	¹ 36
1968-69.....	3,328	683	² 21

¹ Rate for combined first and second years of tenure only.

² Rate for first year of tenure only.

¹⁰ For the methodology pertaining to the establishment of this and other comparison groups used in the BSSR study, the reader should refer to the BSSR Phase I report.

¹¹ In interpreting data on attrition of title IV fellows the reader should bear in mind that resignations do not necessarily mean losses as far as the objective of producing college teachers is concerned. As is shown by data in the next section of this report, many resignees go on and get the doctorate nevertheless. Also, resignees may go into college teaching regardless of whether they obtain doctorates.

classes of fellows commencing their first year of tenure as shown. Data for 1967-68 and 1968-69 are for 2 years and 1 year, respectively, because students in these classes had completed only those numbers of full years of tenure at the time this 10-year report was written.

It will be noted from table 10 that the rate of attrition was 29 percent for the first class of fellows. Then the rate decreased and varied over the next five classes only between 23 and 26 percent before a striking rise to 32 percent for the class of 1965-66 and 36 percent for the class of 1966-67. With 36 percent of the class of 1967-68 resigned by the end of 2 years and 21 percent of the class of 1968-69 resigned by the end of the first year, the attrition rates for the full 3 years of tenure of these two classes are likely to be even higher than the 36 percent of 1966-67.

There are two reasons why the 29 percent rate of attrition of the class of 1959-60 was higher than the five succeeding classes. First, the title IV program was launched on somewhat of a crash basis in 1958-59, and the funds for 840 of the 1,000 fellowships to commence in the fall of 1959 did not become available until June of 1959, well after most of the best graduate prospects had been committed to alternative sources of graduate education support. Second, all 1,000 fellows starting in 1959-60 were beginning graduate students, whereas during the succeeding 5 years, up to 10 percent of the fellows might be advanced graduate students with a fellowship of 1 or 2 years' duration. Such fellows would be less likely to resign than beginning graduate students.

There also appear to be two reasons why the resignation rate took a sharp upswing beginning in 1965-66. First, the rise in the rate corresponds with the escalation of the Vietnam war. Second, as discussed earlier in this chapter, the percentage of title IV fellowships going to women increased significantly beginning in 1965-66, and women have higher resignation rates than men. In its Phase I study of the first four NDEA title IV classes, the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., (BSSR) found that 46 percent of all women fellowship holders in the class of 1959-60 resigned their fellowship before completing their tenure. This compares with a 26 percent rate for men.¹² In the next three classes the resignation rate for women varied between 30 and 40 percent while the rate for men varied between 22 and 24 percent.

The Reasons Why Fellows Resign

There are, of course, various reasons fellows resign their fellowship. Some fail to make the grade academically. Some lose interest in graduate school and drop out. Some change their career goal or change schools and must resign their fellowship because they cannot transfer it. Others drop out because of personal reasons such as finances, marriage, motherhood, and health.

¹² Study of NDEA Title IV Fellowship Program. Phase I, op. cit., p. 49.

Table 11. Percentage distribution of the reasons for resignation of 579 fellows from the classes of 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65.¹

Reason for resignation	Percent of the resignees who resigned for this reason
Academic difficulties	12
Change of career goal	30
Change of school	6
Dissatisfaction with department, school, or program	7
Financial problems	4
Marriage and/or motherhood	6
Other personal reasons	22
Unstated	13

¹ These percentages are based upon 328 resignees from the class of 1962-63, 215 from the class of 1963-64, and 36 from the class of 1964-65, as of the time (March 1965) that this analysis was made.

A fellow may resign because of a combination of reasons rather than for just one reason. In March of 1965 an Office of Education staff study was made of the resignees of the classes of 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65. The study utilized each fellow's resignation letter in determining the principal reason for resignation.¹³ Table 11 shows the composite percentage distribution of the reasons for resignations of 328 resignees from the class of 1962-63, 215 from the class of 1963-64, and 36 from the class of 1964-65. These numbers represented the number of resignees in each of these classes at the time the study was made. It will be noted from table 11 that only 12 percent of the fellows dropped out—either voluntarily or involuntarily—because of academic reasons. This relatively low percentage can no doubt be attributed to the high standards used in selecting title IV fellowship awardees.

Almost one-third (30 percent) resigned their fellowship because of change in career goal. Since only 4 percent dropped out because of financial problems, it appears that title IV program has been accomplishing very well its objective of making it financially possible for fellows to continue in graduate school.

Six percent of the fellows resigned because of marriage or motherhood. Women represented the largest portion of such resignations. An unpublished study made in 1963 by the American Association of University Women of the first four NDEA title IV classes revealed that 30 percent of the resignations of women fellowship holders was due to marriage. It is likely that a large component of this percentage is due to the husband's moving to a job in a new location and the wife's desire to accompany him.

¹³ In its Phase I study, BSSR analyzed the reasons for the resignations of 1,378 fellows from the classes 1959-60 through 1962-63. The BSSR data corresponds quite well with the Office of Education staff study of the classes of 1962-63, 1963-64, and 1964-65, with the slight differences being likely due to classification categories.

Success of the Title IV Program

Title IV was included in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 because of the shortage of college teachers and the firm conviction that a strong system of higher education requiring the services of highly qualified faculty members was essential to the national defense. The Congress has sought to alleviate the shortage through the title IV fellowship program by attracting into graduate study students who were interested in college teaching careers and who, without the financial support provided by the program, might have found it impossible to undertake or complete the necessary training.

In addition to providing stipends and dependency allowances to fellows, the Congress felt it necessary to expand and improve graduate programs across the Nation in order that opportunities for graduate study might be more easily accessible to those who desired it. Toward this end it provided a cost-of-education allowance to an institution for each fellow enrolled. During the first few years of the program, in particular, new doctoral programs were established in regions where they previously did not exist or existed insufficiently.¹⁴

Justifiably, since it had created title IV and provided the funds for its support, the Congress has from the beginning shown interest in how well the title was achieving the objective of increasing the Nation's supply of well-qualified college teachers. This concern has been manifested during the entire life of the title IV program. As mentioned in the chapters of this report dealing with legislative and administrative history, a number of staff studies based primarily upon questionnaires to fellows and institutional coordinators have been made, especially during the earlier years of the program.

These studies were conducted mainly for the purpose of collecting information for congressional hearings, and, with two exceptions, the findings remained unpublished. One was the official report on the first 2 years of title IV operation.¹⁵ This report cited examples where title IV had had considerable influence on the growth of graduate education in a number of States which had produced no doctoral graduates, or very few, up to that time. The second was the survey made by the Office of Education of 102 fellows of the first class of 1959-60 who had indicated to the Office in May of 1962 that they had expectations of receiving their doctorates in June of 1962. Gustave Arlt, President of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, reported the Office's findings on this limited number of fellows in

¹⁴ For examples of establishment of new doctoral programs, see: Clarence B. Lindquist, "Mathematics and Statistics Degrees During the Decade of the Fifties," *American Mathematical Monthly*, (68:7) August-September 1961, p. 664; "Physics Degrees During the 1950's," *Physics Today* (15:1) January, 1962, p. 21; and "Chemistry Degrees During the Decade of the Fifties," *Journal of Chemical Education*, Vol. 39, March, 1962, p. 150.

¹⁵ *National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program: A Report of the First Two Years*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 12 pp.

an article in the May 1963 issue of the *Journal of Higher Education*.¹⁶

Although the staff studies were valuable as a means of keeping Congress informed on the progress of title IV, they were not conclusive because the attainment of a doctorate is generally a slow process and complete, valid data are not available until many years after fellows being studied have entered the program. Thus, it did not become possible until the late years of the 10-year period covered by this report to realistically assess the extent to which the first classes of title IV had attained the objectives of increasing the Nation's number of college teachers.

The success that title IV has had in attaining this objective can be evaluated through an examination of the program's effectiveness in:

- (1) increasing graduate programs for the training of college teachers;
- (2) motivating young people to enter training for college teaching careers;
- (3) increasing, through fellowship support, the number of persons who earn the doctorate, and reducing the time taken to achieve that degree; and,
- (4) encouraging fellows to actually enter higher education employment after they leave graduate school.

That title IV has been successful in (1) and (2) above has been abundantly clear throughout the period of its existence. It is only recently that sufficiently conclusive data from the survey questionnaires of the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., (BSSR) and the record files of the National Academy of Sciences Register of Earned Doctorates have become available for an assessment of (3) and (4).

Attainment of the Doctorate by Title IV Fellows

During the summer of 1969, under a second contract from the Office of Education, BSSR conducted a Phase II study of the fellows who commenced their fellowship tenure in 1960-61 or 1961-62. A questionnaire was sent to each fellow who could be located from the 1,500-member class of each of these two years, regardless of whether he had completed the full tenure of his fellowship. Acceptable responses were obtained from 1,039 members of the 1960-61 class and 1,059 members from the 1961-62 class. A formal report to the Office on the findings of the study had not been made by BSSR at the time this 10-year report was being written, but advance data have been made available.¹⁷

By the summer of 1969, 62 percent of the respondents from the class of 1960-61 and 60 percent of the respondents from the class of 1961-62 had earned a doctorate degree. In the class of 1960-61, doctorates had been earned by 71 percent of those respondents who completed the full tenure of their fellowship compared with only 21 percent of those who had resigned their fellowship before completing full

tenure. For the class of 1961-62, the comparable figures were 68 percent and 21 percent, respectively.

Although 62 percent of the respondents from the 1960-61 class and 60 percent of the respondents from the 1961-62 class had attained a doctorate, an additional 17 percent of the respondents from the 1960-61 class and 20 percent of the respondents from the 1961-62 class had completed all requirements but the dissertation (ABD). In the case of the 1961-62 respondents, 85 percent of the men ABDs and 95 percent of the women ABDs reported that they expected to receive the doctorate in 1970. Hence, the percentage of fellows in each class who eventually earn the doctorate should increase a number of percentage points in 1970 and following years.

What the final percentage will be of *all* fellows in each of the two classes (including resignees) who earn the doctor's degree cannot be estimated with any degree of certainty. The principal reasons for this are (1) the sizable nonresponse rates (31 percent in the case of the 1960-61 class and 30 percent in the case of the 1961-62 class), and (2) the impossibility of determining what percentage of the ABDs will eventually achieve the doctorate. Nevertheless, on the basis of the available data obtained through the BSSR Phase II study, it appears likely that the final figures will be in the range of 55 to 65 percent, which by any standard must be considered very good.¹⁸

Speedup in the Attainment of the Doctorate

The BSSR Phase II study compared the length of time taken to earn the doctorate by 642 title IV fellows of the class of 1960-61 and 628 title IV fellows of the class of 1961-62 with the length of time taken by a comparable group of 310 doctoral recipients who never had a title IV fellowship.¹⁹ Table 12 shows the mean number of years, for the group as a whole as well as for separate academic areas, taken by the classes of NDEA fellows and the comparison group. The mean number of years has been calculated from the date of first entrance into graduate school and the date of conferral of the doctorate.²⁰ For all fields of study, it appears that title IV fellows earn their doctorate, on the average, somewhat more than a year sooner than doctoral recipients who did not have a title IV fellowship. The effect of title IV support is especially evident in the academic area of education, where the mean number of years for the comparison group was 11.6 years compared

¹⁸ For a thorough discussion on attrition of graduate students seeking the doctor's degree, see: Allan Tucker, David Gottlieb, and John Pease. *Attrition of Graduate Students at the Ph.D. Level in the Traditional Arts and Sciences* (Publication No. 8.) U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 1146. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1964. p. 17.

¹⁹ For a detailed analysis of the time taken to earn the doctorate, see: Kenneth M. Wilson, *Of Time and the Doctorate*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965. 212 pp.

²⁰ It will be noted that this table contains a listing of eight academic areas rather than six, as has been used throughout this report. The BSSR Phase II study separated business administration from the social sciences and psychology from the biological sciences.

¹⁶ Gustave Arlt, "The First Ph. D.'s Under Title IV," *Journal of Higher Education* (34:5), May 1963. pp. 241-49.

¹⁷ The formal BSSR report to the Office of Education was expected to be submitted in the summer of 1970.

Table 12. Mean number of years from first entry into graduate study to attainment of the doctorate: Title IV fellows from the classes of 1960-61 and 1961-62 and a 1960-61 non-title IV comparison group ¹

Academic area	Mean number of years taken by		
	1960-61 fellows	1961-62 fellows	1960-61 comparison group
All areas.....	6.0	5.8	7.2
Biology.....	5.2	5.8	6.9
Business administration....	5.8	5.6	9.0
Education.....	6.5	6.3	11.6
Engineering.....	5.8	5.2	6.6
Humanities.....	6.7	6.3	7.5
Physical sciences.....	5.3	5.0	6.8
Psychology.....	5.3	5.4	5.7
Social sciences.....	6.3	6.1	8.3

NOTE: Contrary to the practice used throughout this report, business administration has been listed as an academic area separate from the social sciences and psychology separate from the biological sciences.

¹ See text discussion on number of persons upon whom these data are based.

SOURCE OF DATA: Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D. C.

with 6.5 years for 1960-61 title IV fellows and 6.3 years for the 1961-62 fellows. Education, along with the humanities and social sciences, has been a field relatively unsupported in the past by fellowships.

Percentage of Title IV Fellows in College and University Employment

The BSSR Phase II study asked fellows what their 1969 employment status was. Sixty-five percent of the men and 67 percent of the women reported that they were employed (91 percent of them full time) in a college or university. Almost all were employed in a teaching capacity. As expected, the recipients of a doctorate had a higher percentage in college or university employment than those lacking a doctorate. For the 1960-61 class, 77 percent of the male

doctorate holders and 92 percent of the female doctorate holders were so employed, compared with only 43 percent of the males lacking a doctorate and 48 percent of the females lacking a doctorate. For the 1961-62 class, the comparable figures were 73 percent of the male doctors and 83 percent of the female doctors, compared with 49 percent of both the males and females lacking a doctorate.

The preceding data show a slight increase in college and university employment among NDEA title IV doctorate holders in 1969 as compared with their immediate post-doctoral employment as ascertained in the BSSR Phase I study of the four title IV classes from 1959-60 through 1962-63. The BSSR Phase I study showed that 66 percent of title IV doctorate recipients were to be employed in a college or university following the receipt of their degree. A matched group of doctorate recipients from the files of the National Academy of Sciences Register of Earned Doctorates showed that only 53 percent were entering college or university employment after they received their degree.

An additional fact of significance revealed by the BSSR survey is that, while 65 percent of the male former title IV fellows and 67 percent of the women were actually employed by a college or university in 1969, an additional substantial percent indicated that they hoped eventually to be engaged in such employment. Seventy-six percent of such men from the class of 1960-61 and 81 percent of the women expressed this desire. For the class of 1961-62, the comparable figures were 78 percent of the men and 78 percent of the women.

Conclusion

It is evident from the preceding documentation that NDEA title IV has been eminently successful in increasing the number of well-qualified college teachers. The proportion of fellows who achieve the doctorate is high; the time span taken to earn the doctorate has been appreciably lowered as a result of title IV support; and the percentage of fellows who become college and university teachers is very high. That this is so is not surprising, because, for the most part, NDEA title IV fellows have been a carefully selected, highly motivated group of young people committed to college teaching careers.

appendixes

168

168

168

Appendix A

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
All awards, total.....	1,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	3,000	6,000	6,000	3,328	26,828	100.00
ALABAMA.....	19	25	28	27	23	23	27	70	65	36	343	1.28
Auburn University.....	8	11	9	9	8	10	14	25	25	14	133	0.50
University of Alabama.....	11	14	19	18	15	13	13	45	40	22	210	0.78
ALASKA.....	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	4	2	12	0.04
University of Alaska.....	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	4	2	12	0.04
ARIZONA.....	17	26	28	30	29	28	51	113	90	50	462	1.72
Arizona State University.....	0	5	6	9	9	13	19	33	30	17	141	0.52
University of Arizona.....	17	21	22	21	20	15	32	80	60	33	321	1.20
ARKANSAS.....	13	22	14	11	5	3	8	8	14	8	106	0.40
University of Arkansas.....	13	22	14	11	5	3	8	8	14	8	106	0.40
CALIFORNIA.....	75	110	99	95	97	113	235	537	544	300	2,205	8.20
California Institute of Technology..	2	2	4	2	0	2	24	30	25	14	105	0.39
Claremont Graduate School and University Center.....	9	19	12	11	13	7	2	30	30	17	150	0.56
Loma Linda University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.02
Occidental College.....	9	9	4	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	26	0.10
San Diego State College.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	6	0.02
San Francisco State College.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.01
Stanford University.....	18	26	23	23	14	18	53	95	85	45	400	1.49
University of California, Berkeley..	12	12	14	14	10	12	43	95	85	45	342	1.28
University of California, Davis....	2	2	7	7	4	6	11	38	50	28	155	0.58
University of California, Irvine....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	30	17	51	0.19
University of California, San Diego..	0	6	2	0	4	2	11	14	30	17	86	0.32
University of California, Los Angeles	15	7	12	12	7	17	43	95	85	45	338	1.26
University of California, Riverside..	0	0	0	3	18	17	12	30	27	15	122	0.45
University of California, San Francisco.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	2	11	0.04
University of California, Santa Cruz.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0.02
University of California, Santa Barbara.....	0	0	0	5	10	16	27	30	25	14	127	0.47
University of Southern California..	8	27	21	18	15	14	9	69	60	33	274	1.02
COLORADO.....	24	41	38	27	19	30	47	145	132	74	577	2.15
Colorado School of Mines.....	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	8	4	24	0.09
Colorado State College.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	15	0.06
Colorado State University.....	7	8	10	7	7	6	4	30	25	15	119	0.44
University of Colorado.....	12	21	20	16	5	18	35	95	80	44	346	1.29
University of Denver.....	5	12	8	4	7	5	5	8	12	7	73	0.27
CONNECTICUT.....	16	18	20	15	19	26	50	130	132	72	498	1.86
University of Connecticut.....	16	18	20	15	14	10	5	35	45	25	203	0.76
Wesleyan University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.02
Yale University.....	0	0	0	0	5	16	45	95	85	45	291	1.08

APPENDIX A—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
DELAWARE.....	5	14	9	9	14	6	4	10	12	7	90	0.34
University of Delaware.....	5	14	9	9	14	6	4	10	12	7	90	0.34
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.....	23	31	19	20	22	26	28	80	80	46	375	1.40
American University.....	5	7	5	5	2	2	1	0	2	2	31	0.12
Catholic University.....	2	2	2	2	5	6	13	40	32	18	122	0.46
Georgetown University.....	5	7	2	5	10	15	10	20	20	11	105	0.39
George Washington University....	8	13	8	4	0	0	0	8	14	8	63	0.23
Howard University.....	3	2	2	4	5	3	4	12	12	7	54	0.20
FLORIDA.....	31	28	33	30	34	38	44	164	162	89	653	2.43
Florida State University.....	20	11	13	10	12	13	12	55	60	33	239	0.89
University of Florida.....	4	12	13	14	15	21	20	95	80	44	318	1.18
University of Miami.....	7	5	7	6	7	4	12	14	22	12	96	0.36
GEORGIA.....	22	36	43	34	40	41	83	137	126	69	631	2.35
Emory University.....	9	19	15	13	8	11	15	40	32	18	180	0.67
Georgia Institute of Technology...	7	5	9	7	6	5	34	34	26	14	147	0.55
Medical College of Georgia.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	10	0.04
Georgia State College.....	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	4	2	16	0.06
University of Georgia.....	6	12	19	14	24	23	32	55	60	33	278	1.04
HAWAII.....	8	10	11	12	16	19	24	37	28	15	180	0.67
University of Hawaii.....	8	10	11	12	16	19	24	37	28	15	180	0.67
IDAHO.....	15	17	12	9	4	1	6	10	12	7	93	0.35
University of Idaho.....	15	17	12	9	4	1	6	10	12	7	93	0.35
ILLINOIS.....	35	59	58	78	82	64	222	333	327	176	1,434	5.35
Illinois Institute of Technology....	3	2	3	5	7	4	7	14	14	8	67	0.25
Illinois State University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0.22
Loyola University.....	4	11	7	6	5	5	2	6	12	7	65	0.24
Northern Illinois University.....	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	10	6	29	0.11
Northwestern University.....	6	3	9	18	19	10	65	95	85	45	355	1.32
Southern Illinois University.....	4	2	2	4	10	5	4	24	32	18	105	0.39
University of Chicago.....	8	28	14	23	22	23	75	95	85	45	418	1.56
University of Illinois.....	10	13	23	22	19	12	65	95	85	45	389	1.45
INDIANA.....	34	55	42	48	50	44	137	231	200	108	949	3.54
Ball State University.....	0	0	3	2	2	2	0	6	8	4	27	0.10
DePauw and Purdue Universities..	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	13	0.05
Indiana State University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.02
Indiana University.....	20	30	22	17	22	22	72	95	85	45	430	1.60
Purdue University.....	8	19	11	12	12	10	52	85	65	36	310	1.16
University of Notre Dame.....	6	6	6	11	7	10	13	45	40	21	165	0.61
IOWA.....	12	36	35	31	29	18	29	129	105	59	483	1.80
Iowa State University.....	2	6	6	11	8	5	13	44	35	19	149	0.56
University of Iowa.....	10	30	29	20	21	13	16	85	70	40	334	1.25
KANSAS.....	22	29	36	28	38	36	56	85	93	51	474	1.77
Kansas State University.....	8	13	17	19	16	11	5	25	28	15	157	0.59
University of Kansas.....	14	16	15	9	21	25	51	60	65	36	312	1.16
University of Wichita.....	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	0.02

APPENDIX A—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
KENTUCKY.....	15	13	10	14	13	15	10	41	50	28	209	0.78
University of Kentucky.....	13	11	8	14	11	12	8	35	40	22	174	0.65
University of Louisville.....	2	2	2	0	2	3	2	6	10	6	35	0.13
LOUISIANA.....	27	45	29	28	37	33	52	110	103	59	523	1.95
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.....	8	22	5	10	13	12	9	30	43	24	176	0.66
Louisiana State University, New Orleans.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.01
Tulane University.....	19	23	24	18	24	21	43	80	60	33	345	1.29
MAINE.....	10	4	7	5	9	3	2	4	12	7	63	0.23
University of Maine.....	10	4	7	5	9	3	2	4	12	7	63	0.23
MARYLAND.....	16	25	21	23	35	37	60	119	134	73	543	2.02
Johns Hopkins University.....	11	16	7	14	21	23	49	95	75	41	352	1.31
Peabody Conservatory of Music.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.02
University of Maryland.....	5	9	14	9	14	14	11	24	57	30	187	0.70
MASSACHUSETTS.....	30	46	56	51	57	84	197	278	336	184	1,319	4.92
Boston College.....	0	6	3	2	3	2	3	4	14	8	45	0.17
Boston University.....	7	7	9	7	6	14	23	30	32	17	152	0.57
Brandeis University.....	4	11	12	6	7	17	27	30	40	22	176	0.66
Clark University.....	0	0	0	5	3	3	2	8	10	6	37	0.14
Harvard University.....	0	0	0	0	0	12	54	95	85	45	291	1.09
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.....	4	10	11	8	13	7	31	36	65	36	221	0.82
Northeastern University.....	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	8	9	6	36	0.13
Springfield College.....	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	2	14	0.05
Tufts University.....	3	4	9	9	6	5	4	14	28	15	97	0.36
University of Massachusetts.....	11	5	8	11	10	16	44	45	45	25	220	0.82
Worcester Polytechnic Institute.....	1	3	4	3	5	2	2	4	4	2	30	0.11
MICHIGAN.....	19	50	61	59	50	44	98	185	199	110	875	3.26
Michigan Technological University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0.02
Michigan State University.....	8	18	25	23	26	25	38	70	70	40	343	1.28
University of Detroit.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.01
University of Michigan.....	8	29	22	21	14	12	52	95	85	45	383	1.43
Wayne State University.....	3	3	14	15	10	7	8	16	35	19	130	0.48
Western Michigan University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	10	0.04
MINNESOTA.....	17	28	19	19	14	18	68	95	85	45	408	1.52
University of Minnesota.....	17	28	19	19	14	18	68	95	85	45	408	1.52
MISSISSIPPI.....	23	17	13	12	2	6	5	18	30	17	143	0.53
Mississippi State University.....	12	4	6	5	2	3	2	10	14	8	66	0.25
University of Mississippi.....	11	13	7	7	0	3	3	4	12	7	67	0.25
University of Southern Mississippi.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	10	0.04
MISSOURI.....	28	46	49	45	48	47	126	204	171	97	861	3.21
St. Louis University.....	5	10	7	5	9	7	8	32	30	17	130	0.48
University of Missouri, Columbia.....	10	19	25	23	26	21	48	65	55	31	323	1.20
University of Missouri, Kansas City.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.01
University of Missouri, Rolla ²	0	4	5	5	1	2	9	12	12	7	57	0.21
Washington University.....	13	13	12	12	12	17	61	95	72	40	347	1.29

174

APPENDIX A—Continued

**Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69**

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
MONTANA	11	13	9	14	12	11	12	20	20	11	133	0.50
Montana State University ³	3	9	7	9	9	6	5	12	12	7	79	0.29
University of Montana ³	8	4	2	5	3	5	7	8	8	4	54	0.20
NEBRASKA	9	16	15	16	13	12	8	45	30	18	182	0.68
University of Nebraska.....	9	16	15	16	13	12	8	45	30	18	182	0.68
NEVADA	0	0	0	3	2	5	8	8	8	4	38	0.14
University of Nevada.....	0	0	0	3	2	5	8	8	8	4	38	0.14
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	3	6	9	9	7	10	14	28	16	102	0.38
Dartmouth College.....	0	0	0	4	2	2	3	6	10	6	33	0.12
University of New Hampshire.....	0	3	6	5	7	5	7	8	18	10	69	0.26
NEW JERSEY	12	24	24	28	25	32	48	123	154	85	555	2.07
Newark College of Engineering....	0	0	5	3	2	0	0	4	4	2	20	0.07
Princeton University.....	0	0	0	7	8	16	30	80	82	44	267	1.00
Rutgers University.....	9	22	17	18	13	15	15	35	59	34	237	0.88
Seton Hall University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	0.01
Stevens Institute of Technology....	3	2	2	0	2	1	0	4	9	5	28	0.01
NEW MEXICO	13	13	11	8	5	0	6	40	42	24	162	0.60
New Mexico Highlands University...	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	0.02
New Mexico State University.....	6	8	6	3	3	0	0	10	10	6	52	0.19
University of New Mexico.....	7	5	5	2	0	0	6	30	32	18	105	0.39
NEW YORK	53	88	113	123	145	129	260	628	665	372	2,576	9.60
Alfred University.....	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	0.05
City University of New York.....	0	0	0	14	18	21	42	65	50	28	238	0.89
Clarkson College of Technology....	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	4	4	2	18	0.07
Columbia University (Main Div.)...	3	11	10	9	7	12	18	95	85	45	295	1.10
Columbia University												
Teachers College.....	0	3	6	5	0	6	3	18	21	12	74	0.28
Cornell University.....	11	10	19	21	27	12	35	95	85	45	360	1.34
Fordham University.....	0	4	7	3	5	3	3	16	25	14	80	0.30
Juilliard School of Music.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0.02
New School for Social Research....	4	3	3	0	3	2	3	4	4	2	28	0.10
New York Medical College.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0.01
New York University.....	3	15	11	7	8	7	9	85	80	44	269	1.00
Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn...	8	5	7	11	2	4	4	10	12	7	70	0.26
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute....	5	11	11	11	13	8	2	14	25	14	114	0.42
St. Bonaventure University.....	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	0.02
St. John's University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.01
State University of New York,												
Albany.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	26	14	52	0.19
State University of New York,												
Binghamton.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	13	0.05
State University of New York,												
Buffalo.....	3	5	4	9	4	2	7	36	60	33	163	0.61
State University of New York,												
Stony Brook.....	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	10	18	10	53	0.20
State University of New York,												
College of Forestry.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	10	6	32	0.12
Syracuse University.....	0	3	12	14	27	22	46	50	60	33	267	1.00

APPENDIX A—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
NEW YORK continued.....												
Union Theological Seminary.....	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0.02
University of Rochester.....	8	13	16	10	20	17	65	95	72	40	356	1.33
Yeshiva University.....	0	2	2	7	5	5	0	15	15	8	59	0.22
NORTH CAROLINA.....	42	61	52	52	37	36	124	184	175	99	862	3.21
Duke University.....	16	18	19	18	16	15	50	65	60	33	310	1.16
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.....	13	27	22	19	14	11	55	95	85	45	386	1.44
North Carolina State University, Raleigh ⁴	13	16	11	15	5	8	19	24	30	17	158	0.58
Wake Forest College.....	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4	8	0.03
NORTH DAKOTA.....	8	12	7	18	17	11	15	22	22	12	144	0.54
North Dakota State University....	4	3	2	10	8	7	9	14	14	8	79	0.29
University of North Dakota.....	4	9	5	8	9	4	6	8	8	4	65	0.24
OHIO.....	14	42	45	55	75	70	96	226	231	129	983	3.66
Bowling Green State University....	0	0	0	4	3	2	0	4	7	4	24	0.09
Case Institute of Technology ⁵	0	8	6	17	19	12	10	38	32	—	142	0.53
Western Reserve University ⁵	4	8	3	2	7	10	36	60	45	—	175	0.65
Case Western Reserve University ⁵ ..	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	42	42	0.16
Kent State University.....	0	0	7	6	5	4	6	8	12	17	55	0.21
Miami University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	11	0.04
Ohio State University.....	0	11	16	10	26	28	32	73	70	40	306	1.14
Ohio University.....	10	11	10	9	9	6	6	18	25	14	118	0.44
University of Akron.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0.02
University of Cincinnati.....	0	4	3	3	6	8	2	25	25	14	90	0.33
University of Toledo.....	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	4	2	14	0.05
OKLAHOMA.....	27	33	35	33	24	26	18	70	59	34	359	1.34
Oklahoma State University.....	15	16	17	17	16	11	8	35	27	15	177	0.66
University of Oklahoma.....	12	17	18	16	8	15	10	35	30	17	178	0.66
University of Tulsa.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.02
OREGON.....	26	43	41	36	38	33	80	131	107	59	594	2.21
Oregon State University.....	8	8	11	14	10	10	5	36	32	18	152	0.57
University of Oregon.....	18	30	26	22	28	23	75	95	75	41	433	1.61
Linfield College and Oregon State University.....	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0.03
PENNSYLVANIA.....	34	60	58	58	56	55	153	334	303	176	1,287	4.80
Bryn Mawr College.....	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	7	25	0.09
Carnegie-Mellon University ⁶	5	16	8	16	11	10	29	38	35	19	187	0.79
Drexel Institute of Technology....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	10	0.04
Dropsie College.....	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0.02
Duquesne University.....	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	6	6	3	31	0.12
Hahnemann Medical College and Hospital.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	0.02
Lehigh University.....	0	0	5	8	4	1	5	16	16	9	64	0.24
Pennsylvania State University....	9	5	9	7	4	8	41	95	80	44	302	1.13
Temple University.....	0	6	4	2	2	2	0	19	23	14	72	0.27
University of Pennsylvania.....	10	20	15	9	13	12	49	95	80	45	348	1.30
University of Pittsburgh.....	4	10	17	16	18	16	23	56	45	25	230	0.86
Villanova University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0.01
Woman's Medical College of Pennsylvania.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0.02

APPENDIX A—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
RHODE ISLAND	10	27	31	27	29	29	56	96	78	43	426	1.59
Brown University.....	6	24	25	19	21	19	52	80	60	33	339	1.26
University of Rhode Island.....	4	3	6	8	8	10	4	16	18	10	87	0.32
SOUTH CAROLINA	10	12	16	14	14	13	17	27	39	22	184	0.69
Clemson University.....	8	5	4	6	6	8	12	18	24	13	104	0.39
University of South Carolina.....	2	7	12	8	8	5	5	9	15	9	80	0.30
SOUTH DAKOTA	4	3	3	5	5	9	15	17	17	10	88	0.33
South Dakota State University.....	4	3	3	2	0	0	3	5	5	3	28	0.10
University of South Dakota.....	0	0	0	3	5	9	12	12	12	7	60	0.22
TENNESSEE	39	48	61	49	45	42	49	98	120	67	618	2.30
George Peabody College for Teachers.....	7	10	12	9	4	2	0	10	10	6	70	0.26
University of Tennessee.....	11	16	21	15	19	21	14	53	60	33	263	0.98
Vanderbilt University.....	21	22	28	25	22	19	35	35	50	28	285	1.06
TEXAS	36	62	51	67	56	51	110	205	206	111	955	3.56
Baylor University.....	2	8	5	2	0	0	0	4	4	2	27	0.10
North Texas State University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	13	0.05
Rice University.....	5	13	8	12	14	8	35	56	45	25	221	0.82
Southern Methodist University.....	0	4	0	2	1	6	7	8	10	6	44	0.16
Texas A & M University.....	12	15	9	13	10	8	5	20	28	15	135	0.50
Texas Christian University.....	0	0	2	7	7	5	4	6	6	3	40	0.15
Texas Tech University.....	3	3	3	4	3	2	4	4	8	4	38	0.14
Texas Woman's University.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0.02
University of Houston.....	4	3	2	4	4	5	0	8	10	6	46	0.17
University of Texas, Austin.....	10	16	22	23	17	17	55	95	85	45	385	1.44
UTAH	18	14	13	22	19	27	27	68	81	45	334	1.24
Brigham Young University.....	0	0	0	8	8	10	11	12	14	8	71	0.26
University of Utah.....	14	9	8	9	9	10	10	35	45	25	174	0.65
Utah State University.....	4	5	5	5	2	7	6	21	22	12	89	0.33
VERMONT	3	3	5	3	5	1	1	10	12	7	50	0.19
University of Vermont.....	3	3	5	3	5	1	1	10	12	7	50	0.19
VIRGINIA	28	26	33	36	24	35	57	97	99	56	491	1.83
College of William and Mary.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0.02
Medical College of Virginia.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	11	0.04
University of Virginia.....	19	14	23	21	14	15	43	75	65	36	325	1.21
Virginia Polytechnic Institute.....	9	12	10	15	10	20	14	22	25	14	151	0.56
WASHINGTON	28	34	27	21	31	18	71	125	113	60	528	1.97
University of Washington.....	20	29	22	11	18	8	57	95	85	45	390	1.45
Washington State University.....	8	5	5	10	13	10	14	30	28	15	138	0.51
WEST VIRGINIA	5	5	11	8	9	8	9	10	14	8	87	0.32
West Virginia University.....	5	5	11	8	9	8	9	10	14	8	87	0.32
WISCONSIN	5	19	31	24	12	24	72	113	111	60	476	1.77
Marquette University.....	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	14	16	9	47	0.18
University of Wisconsin, Madison..	5	19	27	22	12	24	75	95	85	45	409	1.52
University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee..	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	6	20	0.07

APPENDIX A—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by State and institution, 1959-60—1968-69

State and Institution	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent ¹
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
WYOMING.....	9	8	10	11	5	11	2	16	16	9	97	0.36
University of Wyoming.....	9	8	10	11	5	11	2	16	16	9	97	0.36
PUERTO RICO.....	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	0.03
University of Puerto Rico.....	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	0.03

¹ Total percentage may not equal exactly 100.00 percent due to rounding of figures in calculations.

² The name of the University of Missouri at Rolla prior to 1965-66 was University of Missouri School of Mines.

³ The name of Montana State University at Bozeman prior to 1966-67 was Montana State College. The name of the University of Montana at Missoula prior to 1966-67 was Montana State University.

⁴ The name of North Carolina State University at Raleigh prior to 1967-68 was North Carolina State College.

⁵ Case Institute of Technology and Western Reserve University merged and became Case Western Reserve University after 1967-68.

⁶ The name of Carnegie-Mellon University prior to 1967-68 was Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Appendix B

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by academic and subacademic areas, 1959-60—1968-69

Academic and subacademic areas	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
All awards, total.....	1,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	3,000	6,000	6,000	3,328	26,828	100.00
NONSCIENCE AREAS												
EDUCATION												
Comparative education.....	5	6	13	11	9	12	6	10	10	0	82	0.31
Counseling and guidance.....	4	11	13	17	13	17	27	33	29	19	183	0.70
Educational administration.....	0	2	9	7	6	0	5	27	22	16	94	0.40
Educational measurement and research design.....	0	0	3	5	6	8	9	8	9	7	55	0.21
Educational psychology.....	7	22	24	25	38	32	48	58	60	32	346	1.30
Elementary and secondary edu- cation.....	4	23	28	22	25	20	46	220	189	81	658	2.45
Philosophy and history of education	4	3	0	0	7	2	8	22	14	4	64	0.24
Physical education.....	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	29	30	19	95	0.40
Special education.....	3	4	3	8	6	8	4	0	0	3	39	0.15
Specialized teaching fields.....	23	29	23	33	25	18	29	27	52	38	297	1.11
Teaching and other general fields	0	10	6	5	6	4	6	2	12	8	59	0.22
Other.....	0	0	0	10	13	8	11	5	4	15	66	0.25
Total.....	50	110	122	143	154	135	210	441	431	242	2,038	7.74
HUMANITIES												
American studies.....	3	0	2	3	12	17	17	36	22	18	130	0.48
Classics.....	8	23	29	0	0	0	0	53	72	41	226	0.84
Comparative literature.....	24	26	24	30	35	31	54	46	65	44	379	1.14
English.....	85	101	91	102	92	96	197	443	479	257	1,943	7.24
Fine arts (principally art).....	4	2	4	0	0	2	4	53	64	34	167	0.62
Journalism.....	0	5	4	1	0	0	3	16	12	2	43	0.16
Linguistics.....	3	13	12	28	28	28	58	53	51	24	298	1.11
Modern languages.....	70	142	119	112	106	104	271	482	440	250	2,096	7.81
Germanic.....	(10)	(39)	(33)	(34)	(36)	(32)	(76)	(123)	(112)	(66)	(561)	(2.09)
Romance.....	(37)	(72)	(77)	(68)	(62)	(61)	(151)	(277)	(228)	(130)	(1,163)	(4.33)
Other.....	(23)	(31)	(9)	(10)	(8)	(11)	(44)	(82)	(100)	(54)	(372)	(1.38)
Music.....	6	16	18	0	0	0	0	91	123	80	334	1.24
Philosophy.....	25	46	46	40	44	75	133	250	238	127	1,024	3.81
Speech and drama.....	11	13	14	0	2	5	0	57	65	42	209	0.77
Other.....	23	29	21	0	4	0	3	0	2	31	113	0.42
Total.....	262	416	384	316	323	358	740	1,580	1,633	950	6,962	25.95
SOCIAL SCIENCES												
Agricultural economics.....	6	10	9	7	9	17	30	45	38	16	187	0.69
Anthropology.....	0	16	14	9	12	13	42	96	87	59	398	1.29
Area studies.....	36	79	48	41	22	35	15	13	18	12	319	1.18
Africa.....	(4)	(8)	(2)	(12)	(3)	(5)	(1)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(35)	(0.13)
Asia.....	(0)	(14)	(6)	(9)	(2)	(8)	(3)	(6)	(5)	(1)	(54)	(0.20)
Latin America.....	(0)	(0)	(15)	(10)	(5)	(13)	(6)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(51)	(0.19)
Near Middle East.....	(3)	(7)	(10)	(3)	(6)	(3)	(3)	(7)	(8)	(7)	(57)	(0.21)
Russia.....	(18)	(33)	(6)	(5)	(6)	(6)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(76)	(0.28)
Other.....	(11)	(17)	(9)	(2)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(5)	(2)	(46)	(0.17)

APPENDIX B—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by academic and subacademic areas, 1959-60—1968-69

Academic and subacademic areas	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
SOCIAL SCIENCES continued												
Business, including business ad- ministration.....	31	35	32	22	27	26	75	148	162	74	632	2.35
City planning.....	0	4	11	0	13	2	13	15	12	8	78	0.29
Economics.....	46	92	80	77	69	71	146	178	217	124	1,100	4.10
Geography.....	0	0	6	10	7	11	53	77	70	41	275	1.02
History.....	42	80	88	72	75	93	181	355	342	191	1,519	5.66
History and philosophy of science	2	8	10	12	12	7	7	14	9	7	88	0.32
International relations.....	18	21	25	25	12	11	12	26	24	13	187	0.69
Library science.....	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	0.04
Political science and government.	34	41	51	62	59	61	179	276	270	138	1,171	4.36
Public administration.....	0	0	4	6	4	2	2	6	7	7	38	0.14
Sociology.....	15	26	25	20	20	24	69	132	113	68	512	1.90
Sociology and anthropology.....	7	7	12	13	7	12	24	37	34	24	177	0.65
Other.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	23	48	92	0.34
Total.....	242	423	416	376	348	385	853	1,435	1,426	831	6,735	25.10
SCIENCE AREAS												
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES and PSYCHOLOGY												
Agriculture, animal science, and foods.....	2	7	12	17	16	6	21	84	66	40	271	1.01
Agronomy and soils.....	18	20	25	19	16	14	11	51	39	24	237	0.88
Bacteriology and microbiology...	12	11	8	12	13	4	8	32	46	32	178	0.66
Bacteriology.....	(4)	(6)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(8)	(5)	(4)	(34)	(0.12)
Microbiology.....	(7)	(1)	(3)	(6)	(7)	(2)	(6)	(22)	(33)	(21)	(108)	(0.40)
Other (includes combinations).	(1)	(4)	(3)	(5)	(4)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(8)	(7)	(36)	(0.13)
Biochemistry, biophysics, and pharmacy.....	7	10	16	17	25	21	30	104	107	56	393	1.46
Biochemistry.....	(7)	(10)	(8)	(11)	(16)	(16)	(24)	(54)	(55)	(26)	(227)	(0.84)
Biophysics.....	(0)	(0)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(5)	(2)	(8)	(4)	(5)	(39)	(0.14)
Pharmacy and pharmacology...	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(2)	(20)	(24)	(14)	(62)	(0.23)
Other (includes combinations).	(0)	(0)	(4)	(1)	(1)	(0)	(2)	(22)	(24)	(11)	(65)	(0.24)
Biology, general.....	10	10	18	22	26	23	63	81	104	58	415	1.54
Botany and plant science.....	23	17	20	38	48	44	65	68	83	47	453	1.68
Ecology.....	3	7	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	0.05
Entomology.....	8	8	12	12	16	6	7	32	31	11	143	0.53
Forestry.....	3	2	2	0	6	2	8	42	26	13	104	0.38
Genetics.....	3	3	4	9	4	4	7	14	9	5	62	0.23
Medical sciences.....	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	9	6	5	28	0.10
Psychology.....	37	23	31	41	61	55	114	272	287	165	1,086	4.04
Speech and hearing science.....	0	9	8	7	10	0	2	7	9	0	52	0.19
Zoology, anatomy, and physiology	35	24	22	37	14	24	39	131	137	91	554	2.06
Anatomy.....	(4)	(2)	(1)	(2)	(0)	(3)	(0)	(13)	(22)	(15)	(62)	(0.23)
Zoology.....	(14)	(15)	(8)	(25)	(13)	(14)	(28)	(84)	(71)	(37)	(309)	(1.15)
Physiology.....	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(3)	(4)	(7)	(14)	(9)	(37)	(0.13)
Other (includes combinations).	(17)	(7)	(13)	(10)	(1)	(4)	(7)	(27)	(30)	(30)	(146)	(0.54)
Total.....	163	153	182	235	255	203	376	927	950	548	3,992	14.87
ENGINEERING												
Aerospace.....	7	2	3	6	6	8	24	43	40	15	154	0.57

177

APPENDIX B—Continued

Number of new NDEA title IV fellowships awarded:
Annually, by year of initial tenure and by academic and subacademic areas, 1959-60—1968-69

Academic and subacademic areas	Number by year of initial tenure										Total number and percent distribution 1959-60—1968-69	
	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65	1965-66	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Number	Percent
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
ENGINEERING continued												
Biomedical.....	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	6	4	23	0.08
Ceramic.....	3	3	2	1	0	0	0	4	4	3	20	0.07
Chemical.....	14	18	36	37	32	25	43	116	96	49	466	1.73
Civil.....	9	30	34	18	14	15	30	60	67	27	298	1.11
Computer sciences.....	3	0	0	6	7	4	8	10	12	4	54	0.20
Electrical.....	20	29	19	29	29	41	53	125	117	57	519	1.93
Engineering, general.....	0	0	0	3	4	7	13	21	15	8	71	0.26
Engineering science.....	3	12	0	4	5	1	8	19	15	4	71	0.26
Geological.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	12	0.04
Industrial.....	0	0	3	3	1	4	3	17	22	12	65	0.24
Mechanical engineering and en- gineering mechanics.....	10	27	42	41	52	44	63	100	107	51	537	2.00
Metallurgy and metallurgical en- gineering.....	3	4	2	1	2	4	10	20	25	10	81	0.30
Nuclear.....	0	0	3	11	4	4	10	25	18	9	84	0.31
Other.....	8	16	0	6	6	5	4	13	19	38	115	0.42
Total.....	80	141	144	166	162	163	275	583	567	289	2,570	9.57
PHYSICAL and MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES												
Astronomy.....	2	8	7	5	10	9	12	19	19	10	101	0.37
Chemistry.....	52	61	60	81	70	70	135	343	317	133	1,322	4.92
Computer sciences.....	4	2	0	2	0	2	4	12	13	4	43	0.16
Geology and earth sciences.....	6	17	18	19	36	33	81	106	101	56	473	1.76
Mathematical sciences.....	78	99	79	73	72	64	155	260	264	130	1,274	4.74
Applied mathematics.....	(13)	(4)	(8)	(7)	(8)	(5)	(9)	(15)	(9)	(2)	(80)	(0.29)
Mathematics.....	(55)	(78)	(51)	(55)	(46)	(43)	(124)	(204)	(207)	(96)	(959)	(3.57)
Statistics.....	(0)	(3)	(6)	(5)	(11)	(14)	(20)	(33)	(30)	(22)	(144)	(0.53)
Other (includes combinations).....	(10)	(14)	(14)	(6)	(7)	(2)	(2)	(8)	(18)	(10)	(91)	(0.33)
Oceanography and meteorology.....	0	7	13	8	10	10	4	26	31	15	124	0.46
Meteorology.....	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(0)	(4)	(3)	(5)	(14)	(0.05)
Oceanography.....	(0)	(0)	(6)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(0)	(13)	(11)	(10)	(52)	(0.19)
Other (includes combinations).....	(0)	(7)	(7)	(5)	(6)	(3)	(4)	(9)	(17)	(0)	(58)	(0.21)
Physics.....	61	63	75	76	60	68	155	268	248	120	1,194	4.45
Total.....	203	257	252	264	258	256	546	1,034	993	468	4,531	16.88

Appendix C

Comparison of percentage distribution of 26,828 new NDEA title IV fellowships with (1) the spring 1963 percentage distribution of 138,149 teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges and the percentage of these faculty possessing the doctorate, and (2) the percentage distribution of the combined total of doctorates awarded in 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68: By academic and subacademic areas, aggregate United States

Academic and subacademic area	Percent distribution of total (26,828) new fellowships 1959-60-1968-69	Percent distribution of total (138,149) teaching faculty spring 1963	Percent of teachers in column (2) who possess the doctorate	Percent distribution of total (45,742) doctorates awarded 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
NONSCIENCE AREA				
Total.....	58.65	58.90	46.7	44.98
EDUCATION				
Counseling and guidance.....	0.70	0.35	71.7	1.26
Educational administration.....	0.40	0.55	84.4	*
Educational psychology.....	1.30	1.11	73.2	0.39
Elementary and secondary education.....	2.20	3.42	57.4	1.43
Physical education.....	0.40	*	*	0.80
Other.....	2.77	8.28	*	13.41
Total.....	7.77	13.71	42.8	17.29
HUMANITIES				
American studies.....	0.48	*	*	0.19
Classics.....	0.84	0.70	62.7	0.34
English & comparative literature.....	8.65	8.06	47.2	4.13
Fine arts.....	0.62	2.78	15.0	0.28
Journalism.....	0.16	0.42	25.4	0.11
Linguistics.....	1.11	*	*	0.35
Modern languages.....	7.81	4.72	54.0	1.62
Germanic.....	(2.09)	(1.11)	(60.0)	(0.40)
Romance.....	(4.34)	(2.86)	(50.0)	(1.05)
Other.....	(1.39)	(0.75)	(60.9)	(0.17)
Music.....	1.24	4.52	25.3	1.00
Philosophy.....	3.82	1.60	68.7	1.20
Speech and drama.....	0.78	2.34	40.0	1.31
Other.....	0.42	3.02	35.9	2.68
Total.....	25.93	26.80	42.4	12.82
SOCIAL SCIENCES				
Agricultural economics.....	0.70	*	*	0.73
Anthropology.....	1.30	0.53	81.3	0.65
Area (foreign) studies.....	1.20	*	*	0.29
Business.....	2.36	5.01	38.4	1.82
Economics.....	4.10	2.32	66.9	2.55
Geography.....	1.03	*	*	0.49
History.....	5.70	4.24	66.6	3.08
International relations.....	0.70	*	*	0.30
Library science.....	0.04	0.35	13.1	0.13
Political science.....	2.49	2.10	71.9	1.94
Public administration.....	0.14	*	*	0.17
Sociology.....	1.91	1.74	65.6	1.65
Other.....	1.66	2.10	*	1.08
Total.....	25.24	18.39	55.7	14.88

APPENDIX C—Continued

Comparison of percentage distribution of 26,828 new NDEA title IV fellowships with (1) the spring 1963 percentage distribution of 138,149 teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges and the percentage of these faculty possessing the doctorate, and (2) the percentage distribution of the combined total of doctorates awarded in 1959-60, 1962-63, and 1967-68: By academic and subacademic areas, aggregate United States

Academic and subacademic area	Percent distribution of total (26,828) new fellowships 1959-60—1968-69	Percent distribution of total (138,149) teaching faculty spring 1963	Percent of teachers in column (2) who possess the doctorate	Percent distribution of total (45,742) doctorates awarded 1959-60, 1962-63 and 1967-68
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
SCIENCE AREA				
Total.....	41.35	39.21	58.1	54.49
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES AND PSYCHOLOGY				
Agricultural and related fields.....	2.29	2.16	50.6	3.34
Anatomy.....	0.23	*	*	0.40
Bacteriology and microbiology.....	0.66	0.96	79.9	1.40
Biochemistry.....	0.85	0.92	98.3	1.80
Biology, general.....	1.55	1.30	62.2	1.40
Biophysics.....	0.15	*	*	0.26
Botany.....	1.70	0.71	79.4	1.20
Entomology.....	0.53	*	*	0.71
Genetics.....	0.23	0.42	89.0	0.50
Physiology.....	0.14	0.75	74.4	0.73
Psychology.....	4.05	2.80	81.8	6.10
Zoology.....	1.20	1.10	71.8	1.61
Other.....	1.36	7.13	*	2.94
Total.....	14.94	18.25	60.3	22.39
ENGINEERING				
Aerospace.....	0.60	0.29	47.5	0.56
Chemical.....	1.74	0.48	79.3	1.69
Civil.....	1.11	1.25	36.2	1.29
Electrical.....	1.93	1.46	42.3	2.87
Engineering science.....	0.30	0.29	46.4	0.53
Industrial.....	0.24	0.20	26.0	0.34
Mechanical.....	2.00	1.54	27.3	1.46
Metallurgical.....	0.30	0.26	68.8	0.77
Other.....	1.44	1.10	*	1.63
Total.....	9.66	6.87	39.0	11.14
PHYSICAL AND MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES				
Astronomy.....	0.38	*	*	0.80
Chemistry.....	4.93	3.79	79.8	8.72
Geology and earth sciences.....	1.80	1.22	74.9	1.54
Mathematical sciences.....	4.75	5.53	47.9	3.79
Oceanography and meteorology.....	0.50	0.43	*	0.42
Physics.....	4.50	3.05	69.0	5.46
Other.....	0.16	0.07	*	0.23
Total.....	17.02	14.09	64.4	20.96
FIELDS NOT CLASSIFIABLE IN ANY OF THE ABOVE AREAS¹	0.00	1.89	*	0.52

*Not ascertainable as a separate component. Included in other categories.

¹ Includes such fields as architecture and military science not classifiable under any of the preceding academic areas.

Appendix D

Administrative Heads of Graduate Fellowship Program and Membership of Title IV Advisory Committee: Year by Year

1958-59

J. P. ELDER

Administrative Head of Program

LEONARD B. BEACH, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

ROBERT W. MACVICAR, *Vice President and Dean*
The Graduate School
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

HAROLD L. HAZEN, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ROSEMARY PARK, *President*
Barnard College
New York, New York

HENRY H. HILL, *President*
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

JOHN A. PERKINS, *President*
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

THE RT. REV. MSGR. FREDERICK G. HOCHWALT,
Executive Secretary
The National Catholic Educational Association
Washington, D.C.

J. SAUNDERS REDDING, *Professor*
Hampton Institute
Hampton, Virginia

WALTER LOEWING, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

JOHN C. WEAVER, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

ROBERT M. LUMIANSKY, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

LLOYD S. WOODBURN, *Dean*
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

1959-60

HENRY E. BENT

Administrative Head of Program

LEONARD B. BEACH, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

FELTON G. CLARK, *President*
Southern University and
Agricultural and Mechanical
College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

0081

J. P. ELDER, *Dean*
The Graduate School of Arts
and Sciences
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

HAROLD L. HAZEN, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

HENRY H. HILL, *President*
George Peabody College for Teachers
Nashville, Tennessee

WALTER LOEHWING, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

ROBERT W. MACVICAR, *Vice President and Dean*
The Graduate School
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

REV. JOSEPH F. MULLIGAN, S.J.
Chairman, Physics Department
Fordham University
New York, New York

ROSEMARY PARK, *President*
Connecticut College for Women
New London, Connecticut

JOHN A. PERKINS, *President*
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware

JOHN C. WEAVER, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Nebraska
Lincoln, Nebraska

LLOYD S. WOODBURN, *Dean*
College of Arts and Sciences
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

1960-61

ROBERT H. BRUCE

Administrative Head of Program

HENRY E. BENT, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

FELTON G. CLARK, *President*
Southern University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

FRANK G. DICKEY, *President*
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

RICHARD G. FOLSOM, *President*
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

ALEXANDER HEARD, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

ROBERT W. MACVICAR, *Vice President and Dean*
The Graduate School
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

REV. JOSEPH F. MULLIGAN, S.J.
Chairman, Physics Department
Fordham University
New York, New York

ANNE THOMAS PANNELL, *President*
Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

DAVID L. PATRICK, *Coordinator of Research*
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

HAROLD W. STOKE, *President*
Queens College
Flushing, New York

W. GORDON WHALEY, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

LLOYD S. WOODBURN, *Professor*
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

1961-62

HAROLD HOWE

Administrative Head of Program

HENRY E. BENT, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

REV. JOSEPH F. MULLIGAN, S.J.
Chairman, Physics Department
Fordham University
New York, New York

FELTON G. CLARK, *President*
Southern University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

ANNE THOMAS PANNELL, *President*
Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

FRANK G. DICKEY, *President*
University of Kentucky
Lexington, Kentucky

DAVID L. PATRICK, *Coordinator of Research*
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

RICHARD G. FOLSOM, *President*
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

HAROLD W. STOKES, *President*
Queens College
Flushing, New York

ALEXANDER HEARD, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

W. GORDON WHALEY, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

ROBERT W. MACVICAR, *Vice President and Dean*
The Graduate School
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

LLOYD S. WOODBURN, *Professor*
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

1962-63

EVERETT WALTERS

Administrative Head of Program

ADRIAN A. ALBERT, *Dean*
Division of Physical Sciences
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

RICHARD G. FOLSOM, *President*
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

JOHN W. ASHTON, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

HAROLD HOWE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

HENRY E. BENT, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

REV. JOSEPH F. MULLIGAN, S.J.
Chairman, Physics Department
Fordham University
New York, New York

FELTON G. CLARK, *President*
Southern University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

ANNE THOMAS PANNELL, *President*
Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

HAROLD W. STOKES, *President*
Queens College
Flushing, New York

W. GORDON WHALEY, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

LLOYD S. WOODBURN, *Professor*
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

1963-64

ALAN D. FERGUSON

Administrative Head of Program

ADRIAN A. ALBERT, *Dean*
Division of Physical Sciences
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

HAROLD HOWE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas

JOHN W. ASHTON, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

ANNE THOMAS PANNELL, *President*
Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

HENRY E. BENT, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Missouri
Columbia, Missouri

LINDLEY J. STILES, *Dean*
School of Education
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

ROBERT H. BRUCE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

HAROLD W. STOKES, *President*
Queens College
Flushing, New York

W. GORDON WHALEY, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

RICHARD G. FOLSOM, *President*
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Troy, New York

NOTE: There were only 10 members of the Title IV Advisory Committee in 1963-64 rather than the usual 12.

1964-65

ALAN D. FERGUSON

Administrative Head of Program

(July to March)

JAMES H. BLESSING

Acting Administrative Head of Program

(March to July)

ADRIAN A. ALBERT, *Dean*
Division of Physical Sciences
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

HARRY ALPERT, *Dean*
The Faculties
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

JOHN W. ASHTON, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

ROBERT H. BRUCE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

HAROLD E. FINLEY, *Head*
Department of Zoology
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

MARIO J. GOGLIA, *Dean*
The Graduate Division
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

REV. R. J. HENLE, S.J.
Academic Vice President
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

ROBERT HOFSTADTER, *Professor*
Department of Physics
Stanford University
Stanford, California

HAROLD HOWE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

GEORGES MAY, *Dean*
Yale College
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

ANNE THOMAS PANNELL, *President*
Sweet Briar College
Sweet Briar, Virginia

LINDLEY J. STILES, *Dean*
School of Education
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

1965-66

PRESTON VALIEN

Administrative Head of Program

JAMES H. BLESSING

Assistant Head of Program

ADRIAN A. ALBERT, *Dean*
Division of Physical Sciences
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

HARRY ALPERT, *Dean*
The Faculties
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

ROBERT H. BRUCE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Wyoming
Laramie, Wyoming

HAROLD E. FINLEY, *Head*
Department of Zoology
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

MARIO J. GOGLIA, *Dean*
The Graduate Division
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

HAROLD HOWE, *Dean*
The Graduate School
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

GEORGES MAY, *Dean*
Yale College
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Consultants*

WINFRED GODWIN, *Director*
Southern Regional Education Board
Atlanta, Georgia

REV. ROBERT J. HENLE, *S.J.*
Academic Vice President
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

MINA REES, *Dean*
The Graduate School
City University of New York
New York, New York

JOHN SNELL, JR., *Dean*
The Graduate School
Tulane University
New Orleans, Louisiana

DAEL WOLFLE, *Executive Officer*
American Association for the
Advancement of Science
Washington, D.C.

*There were only seven persons in 1965-66 holding official appointments as Title IV Advisory Committee members. The five persons listed above as consultants served in the capacity of Committee members though they did not hold official appointments.

1966-67

RICHARD L. PREDMORE

Administrative Head of Program

GEORGE B. LANE

Assistant Head of Program

HARRY ALPERT, *Dean*
The Faculties
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

JOHN W. ASHTON, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

ROBERT H. BAKER, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

FREDERICK H. BURKHARDT, *President*
American Council of Learned Societies
New York, New York

CARLOS CADENA, *Associate Justice*
Fourth Court of Civil Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

EVELYN BOYD COLLINS, *Mathematician*
International Business Machines Corporation
Los Angeles, California

HAROLD E. FINLEY, *Head*
Department of Zoology
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

MARIO J. GOGLIA, *Dean*
The Graduate Division
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia

PALMER HOYT, *Editor and Publisher*
The Denver Post
Denver, Colorado

REV. ROBERT J. HENLE, S.J.
Academic Vice President
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

GEORGES MAY, *Dean*
Yale College
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

ALICE ROSE STEWART, *Professor*
Department of History and Government
University of Maine
Orono, Maine

1967-68

DAVID B. CARPENTER

Administrative Head of Program

GEORGE B. LANE

Assistant Head of Program

JOHN W. ASHTON
University Professor of English and Folklore
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

ROBERT H. BAKER, *Dean*
The Graduate School
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

FREDERICK H. BURKHARDT, *President*
American Council of Learned Societies
New York, New York

CARLOS CADENA, *Associate Justice*
Fourth Court of Civil Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

EVELYN BOYD COLLINS
Assistant Professor
California State College at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

HAROLD E. FINLEY, *Head*
Department of Zoology
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

MARIO J. GOGLIA
Vice Chancellor for Research
University System of Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia

PALMER HOYT, *Editor and Publisher*
The Denver Post
Denver, Colorado

REV. ROBERT J. HENLE, S.J.
Academic Vice President
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

JOSEPH L. MCCARTHY, *Dean*
The Graduate School
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

GEORGES MAY, *Dean*
Yale College
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

ALICE ROSE STEWART, *Professor*
Department of History and Government
University of Maine
Orono, Maine

July 1968–December 1968

MAX GOODRICH

Administrative Head of Program

LAWRENCE W. FRIEDRICH

Assistant Head of Program

JOHN W. ASHTON

University Professor of English and Folklore
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

ROBERT H. BAKER, *Dean*

The Graduate School
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

FREDERICK H. BURKHARDT, *President*

American Council of Learned Societies
New York, New York

CARLOS CADENA, *Associate Justice*

Fourth Court of Civil Appeals
San Antonio, Texas

EVELYN BOYD COLLINS

Assistant Professor
California State College at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California

HAROLD E. FINLEY, *Head*

Department of Zoology
Howard University
Washington, D.C.

MARIO J. GOGLIA

Vice Chancellor for Research
University System of Georgia
Atlanta, Georgia

PALMER HOYT, *Editor and Publisher*

The Denver Post
Denver, Colorado

REV. ROBERT J. HENLE, S.J.

Academic Vice President
St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

JOSEPH L. MCCARTHY, *Dean*

The Graduate School
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

GEORGES MAY, *Dean*

Yale College
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

ALICE ROSE STEWART, *Professor*

Department of History and Government
University of Maine
Orono, Maine